





JOHN WHITE, A. M.

THE  
RESTORATION OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES  
TO THEIR  
ANCIENT READING,  
THEIR  
PHILOSOPHY, AND HARMONY  
WITH THE  
STATE AND PHYSICAL FORMS OF MAN,  
IN A  
TRANSLATION OF THE HOLY EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE GALATIANS,  
AND A PART OF HIS EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS,  
FROM  
THE ORIGINAL GREEK INTO ENGLISH,  
WITH  
NOTES, CRITICAL AND EXPLANATORY;  
AND IN AN  
INTRODUCTORY DISSERTATION ON THE STYLE, INTELLIGENCE, AND SPIRIT,  
OF THE HOLY EVANGELIST JOHN;  
By JOHN WHITE, A.M.

אל רעמר בכל הכתר החרר: המלט פן רמפר:

"Stay not in all *THE PLAIN*, *escape to the MOUNTAIN*."—GENESIS.

"Jesus however went up to *the Mountain*, and there he sat with his disciples."—JOHN.

"I have seen Paradise with the eye of my mind, its top towers above the tops of other mountains, and though the waters of the deluge have covered the earth, they have rubbed only its base."—EPHREM SYRUS.

---

LONDON:  
SHERWOOD, GILBERT, & PIPER,  
PATERNOSTER ROW.

---

Printed by J. L. Cox and Sons, 75, Great Queen Street,  
Lincoln's-Inn Fields.

---

TO  
HER MAJESTY QUEEN VICTORIA.

---

MADAM,

To You, as the *Legal Head* of the Protestant Church of England and Ireland, I dedicate this work. In doing so, however, allow me to assure your Majesty, whose government I look upon as the dawn of a better state of things, that I have no sectarian notions in Philosophy, Religion, Literature, or Government. With many, however, I do see monstrous social evils surrounding us, and overwhelming the truly good and noble; yet I solicit no *new moral world*, or point out any panacea for our unhealthy moral physical condition, than the *ancient delineations* of the *ancient moral world* of the *Holy Scriptures*, translated into our language and reduced to practice. It is a great and crying grievance, that after eighteen hundred years we should even yet possess no translation of the Greek Scriptures in our language on which we can depend—that in many cases we are even compelled *by law* to read nonsense for sense, and falsehood for truth—after all the immense sums lavished on our clergy for the instruction of the multitudes, we should still be living in ignorance of their contents and the meaning of the Holy Gospels—after all the hue and cry about Greek literature from this and that quarter, the beautiful delineations of themselves and the *Holy Mountain*, on which the Messiah and the

good live—the very ΤΟ ΟΡΟΣ—*ioğ the Tor*—the *طور* the *Tur*—the holy *mountain*, with which, *though* Christian, your Majesty, from the education you have received, cannot be acquainted.

True, it may be replied that your Bishops should see to this. I am afraid, however, that they have adopted the spirit and maxims and Sectarian Literature of the age—that they have sold, like Esau, their birthright for a mess of pottage—that the priests, in short, have become like the people, *lovers of gifts and followers after rewards*. The *good* consequently, in the words of the holy prophet, *perish from our streets, and few lay it to heart*. Nor is it much consolation for them to behold the day of reckoning coming over England—that already the growling, grumbling elements of anarchy, like the sounds that precede the explosion of the terrific volcano or the desolating earthquake, are heard from afar. The retributive scenes of justice, which the pages of history so often unfold to our view, must be exhibited. Where, without visiting the Ganges, crossing the Atlantic, or looking at Spain, are the empires of ancient Egypt, of Assyria, Babylon, Persia, Macedon, Carthage, Rome? In some the grass grows in the streets, in others the fox looks out of the window.

I am,

MADAM,

Your MAJESTY's truly loyal Subject,

JOHN WHITE.

## INTRODUCTION.

---

THE element of God is truth, wisdom and benevolence, working hand in hand. Every falsehood, therefore, and course of action, of whatever nature, not based on these principles, may be considered atheistic or hostile to God, even though in every case he makes the falsehood do his will and work his pleasure. His laws and government, unlike the sectarian laws of human governments, are perfect and universal. Around his throne and in his court the good always find favour and protection. There is no addition or subtraction, no selfishness or injustice in the provinces of his empire; there is no turning or winding, no knavery or chicanery of thought or action, which his laws do not reach or counteract; yet fools say in their conduct, there is no Governor! The bricks are fallen down, but we will build with hewn stone; the sycamores are cut down, but we will change them into cedars! Governments of men, ignorant of the laws, even the philosophic arrangements of all things, and crediting the reign of chaos, make by-laws for isolated portions of their subjects, foolishly imagining that they can raise—a thing impossible for God himself to do, and yet govern mankind—any portion or class of men without degrading or overthrowing the whole. The thing is a pure atheism or monstrous absurdity. Casting your eyes over society, you may see individuals and families and coteries innumerable, proceeding on the same chaotic, atheistic basis, working out a snug independency, as they call it, at the expense of their neighbours, without any

deterioration, as they dream, to themselves, their progeny, or their immediate personal associates. The course, however, is a monstrous absurdity, capable of entering only the heads of the senseless and insane; opposed as it is to the obvious connection between cause and effect, between things and their resemblances; opposed as it is to the wise arrangements of the Eternal in man, which from similar causes invariably *work* similar effects; which, in short, the more that the animal and selfishness and pride and anger are worked out in spirit, *whatever be the veil cast over the actions of the man*, in the very same ratio create a flesh of selfish, destructive, and consequently discordant materials, present a corresponding destructive form, and diffuse over the nervous system the streamlets of death. The very same principles, the same chaotic, selfish modes of acting are carried out into almost all parts of society. With some orators and demagogues, indeed, it matters not what the people are taught, what they believe or take for truth; it all comes with these fools to the same thing. Tush! say these wise men, the people know it not, and what does it matter? The very same mania, where you would least of all expect it, appears operating often among the clergy themselves, the guides and leaders of the people, among the ambassadors of God, as the impious often term themselves, even among those who call themselves philosophers. But whatever individuals, snug coteries, demagogues, clergy, or governments preach up, the laws or truths of the Eternal go on to *work* their way, and to destroy all isolated clubs, kings and kingdoms. It may therefore without any elaborate proof be taken for granted, that whoever preaches truths, moral, religious, intuitive truths, in harmony with the physical form and condition of man, is the fellow-worker of God, and consequently the friend of every individual in society, of every state and government. Besides, in studying for the church, I found the creed and the representations of the Chris-



tianity now preached at war with the Christianity of the scriptures.

These are the things that have given rise to the present laborious work. Christianity, the basis of the work, assumes its origin from God. It must therefore be a system of truths in perfect harmony with his government, his works, and the state of man, explained under the common, well-known medium of human signs. Hence, for example, the excellent classification of society in the parable of the sower, where mankind are grouped under various soils and placed in different localities. The *wayside*, *παρά την οδόν*, presents a diversified animal, indifferently moral intellectual class, exposed by their position in life to disagreeable circumstances, and consequently not very able, even though willing, to perfect any of their more holy aspirations. The rock or stony ground classification, *ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν*, the *τα πετρῶδη ὅπου ἔχει γῆν πολλήν*, are a miserably selfish animal class, presenting for a time when the sunshine of prosperity lasts, and the thirst for gold and the animal and vulgar applause is comparatively quenched through the very moderate, or it may be unfortunately, *αστοργούς*, heartless qualities, a favourable aspect, but obviously born, *μὴ εἶναι βάθος γῆς*, *deficient in the essentials of the man and the God!* The *ἐπὶ τὰς ἀκανθὰς*, *thorns*, are they whose mixed and conflicting endowments present little but continual undulations of sins and repentances, where the good resolutions of the morning are drowned in the daily sneaking, selfish, lying pursuits, and animal gratifications of the evening. It is necessary to refer to these intuitive, mathematical, moral and physical truths, the basis of Christianity, which harmonize as all truths must do with their consequences, *the noble and ignoble forms and actions of mankind*: for there is but one law of mind and matter and goodness and form in the universe! If, however, the Testament is not translated or misrepresented, the clergy

must be preaching falsehoods in the name of God, a horrid and monstrous state of things.

*The Works of God favourable to Investigation.—  
Eastern and Western Christians.*

It may farther be observed, that there are on the part of God no impediments thrown in the way of the student of his works of creation and providence. The manifestations of the God and the state of man are parts of creation and providence. Bad creatures, or incarnate evils, on the contrary, have in all ages uniformly opposed and misrepresented this disposition of the Eternal, even while the greatest lights in all centuries have maintained the opposite doctrine. The very translation of the Scriptures, designed entirely for the description and good of man, has been resisted and condemned by the refuse of the earth. Much has been written on this subject to little purpose. Here, however, the Eastern translations should always receive the first consideration, and be regarded as among the best interpreters. The Western Christians, miserably behind the Eastern, have in their ignorance and impudence represented themselves as the only interpreters, even though Augustine himself, of whom the Roman sect boasts, says that variety of translations is favourable for the discovery of the sense of scripture. Into this topic, however, there is scarcely any room left for entering. No language of the East is more important than the Syriac, rich as it is in works on the Scriptures, which the people of Syria and Mount Lebanon, and the surrounding countries, have enjoyed from the days of the apostles. No part, however, of the East has been subject to greater changes, or suffered more from the injustice of tyrants and the inroads of barbarians. Even yet it is destined under Mehemet Ali to feel the same beastly things. But when the western world was comparatively in its infancy, and sunk in great ignorance and

superstition before and during what are called the dark ages, Syria enjoyed considerable light and produced one great man after another, writing in the very language of the Evangelists; nevertheless, the Western Christians, or Roman section of Christianity, with which the Protestants themselves must be identified, have long impudently dictated to the Eastern, and domineered over them by means peculiar to the reign of falsehood and the rampant growth of a horrid, deceitful, superstitious barbarism, impiously termed religion and theism. Cerinthus, Cerdo, Simon, Bar Desanes, Valentinus, Marcion, Basilides, Manes, and other great men of the East, flourished in the first centuries, whose works the Western Christians have not only put out of the way or destroyed, but given the writers false characters, for the express purpose of rendering them infamous. According to them, they were not only heretics and blasphemers, but monsters in morals and falsifiers of the Greek text. Marcion, for example, who in the second century came from the East to Rome, appears from the representations, or rather misrepresentations, given of him, to have been a great man and a good scholar, and, I think, understood the Scriptures. He maintained, it is said, the divinity of the Messiah, but rejected his humanity. The former assertion is true, the latter false. From what I can gather, he appears to have denied only the *vulgar* humanity, but supported the fleshly humanity of the Evangelist John—made *itself a flesh and dwelt in us*, not *dwelt among us*—maintained that the sufferings of the Messiah arose and arise from the animal, selfish and destructive qualities of man—maintained in substance the very heresy, of which I and Paul and the Evangelists are guilty, of which I was not aware till I had investigated the subject. I have no objection, therefore, to be numbered among such heretics. Several books, of no consequence or merit in themselves, under the name of Tertullian, exist against Marcion; but the authorship may be considered doubtful. Besides, the

Nestorian Syrian church has, through all centuries of Christianity, supported opposite doctrines to the Roman or Western section.

Nor is there room for noticing the early translations of our own country. It appears, however, that Saxon or Dano-Saxon translations of the gospels existed in the eighth or ninth century. Even Bede, a celebrated man of his age, does not appear to have known the Greek. Mixed Saxon and old English portions of the Scriptures followed these before the time of Wiclif. This Reformer's translation appears to have been the most extensive, though it would appear that there were several attempts at translation; for under a council held at Oxford in the fourteenth century, over which Thomas Arundel, Archbishop of Canterbury, presided, measures were taken to prevent any heretical version, such as that of John Wiclif, who had been declared a heretic, or any of his followers, from being read or published. On this topic, the Douay in after years says, "that since Luther's revolt also, diverse learned Catholics, for the more speedy abolition of a number of false and impious translations put forth by sundry sects, and for the good of souls endangered by them, have published the Bible in several languages of almost all the principal provinces of the Latin church, no other books in the world being so pernicious as heretical translations of the scriptures."

*Ignorance Destroys the Scriptures and the People.*

Where literature does not flourish, or is discouraged, the Greek Testament, which is essentially a book of learned literature, a beautiful focus of the light of thousands of years, must be destroyed in the hands of the ignorant. Darkness must consequently cover the earth, and gross darkness the people. The reign of chaos, of superstition, and the beast succeeds. The intellectual and moral qualities are bewildered, gold and silver are worshipped, the gilded carriage and liveried lackey admired, the people hateful and hating, abject,

miserable, contemptible. For nearly a thousand years great ignorance of literature, of the Greek, the Hebrew, and Chaldee, prevailed over Europe, which darkened the whole face of society. Buxtorf remarks the same fact: *Post Hieronymi tempora studium linguarum sacrarum diu cessasse videtur; unde non tantum translatio ipsius graviore depravationes passa est, quam nunquam antea biblia Græca, quæ subinde suos cultores et restauratores habuere, sed et in universa doctrina ecclesiæ horrendæ tenebræ obortæ sunt, quæ ad mille fere annos durarunt.* Scarcely any of those called, or rather miscalled, fathers of the Western section, knew the Greek, and less of the Syriac and Hebrew. Wiclif himself, born about thirteen hundred and twenty, who created a great sensation during this darkness, does not appear to have been capable of translating out of the Greek. From many circumstances which cannot be noticed here, he must have followed the Latin vulgate. For the purpose, however, of giving to the general reader some knowledge of this great reformer's translation, and the state of the English language of the fourteenth century, I subjoin a few verses of his translation of the first chapter of John's Gospel.

*Wiclif's Translation of John.*

“ In the bigynnyng was the word, and the word was at God, and God was the word. This was in the bigynnyng at God. Alle thingis weren maad by hym, and withouten him was maad nothing, that thing that was maad. In him was lyf, and the lyf was the light of men. And the light schyneth in derknessis, and derknessis tooken not it. A man was sent fro God, to whom the name was Jon. This man came into witnessyng that he schulde bere witnessyng of the light. Ther was a verey light which lightneth ech man that cometh into this world. He was in the world & the world was maad by him, and the world knew him not. He came into hisce owne thingis, and his owne resceyue-

den him not. But how manye euere resceyueden him, he gaf to hem power to be maad the sones of God, to hem that bileueden in his name: the whiche not of blodis, neither of the wille of fleisch, neither of the wille of man, but ben borun of God. And the word was maad man and dwellide among us, and we han seyn the glorie of him, as the glorie of the oon bigetun sone of the fadir full of grace and of treuthe. Jon berith witnessyng of him and crieth & seth this is whom I seide, he that schal come aftir me, is maad before me, for he was tofore me."

This was good English when Wiclif wrote. He translates was maad *man*; but as Theophylactus remarks in his Greek Commentary on John, the word did not become *man*, but *flesh*.

### *The difficulty of the Greek Testament.*

Almost all people take upon themselves the explanation of the Scriptures and the Greek Testament, yet no subject is more difficult, no book requires greater talents, acquisitions, or more consideration, apart altogether from those dispositions and adventitious circumstances which form the groundwork of the whole. Even those who know little of the matter may perceive, from the translations before them in the work, some of the difficulties. One's eyes may become dim in comparing passages, reading books, deciphering manuscripts—and the mental and moral energies, though exercised and encouraged, exhausted under the process. The judgment and comparison, the discretion and penetration necessary are extraordinary, particularly when the sense and reading of the Scriptures are entirely destroyed by ignorant people. Michaelis, who knew the Scriptures better than the generality of learned men, says: "Divines, who confine their studies to the Greek Testament alone, and without learning the oriental languages aspire to the title of theologians, lead not only themselves into error, but those to whom they undertake to commu-

nicate instruction ; and I may venture to affirm, that no man is capable of understanding the New Testament, unless to an acquaintance with Greek he joins a knowledge of at least Hebrew, Syriac, Rabbinic." " Few profane authors," says Ernesti, a man of very considerable learning, " are so difficult as the Greek Testament." It requires qualifications beyond the reach of common abilities. He should even indeed know the Persian, Arabic, Samaritan, Coptic ; and extend his researches into the Sanskrit, for the purpose of seeing their views of goodness, and the consciousness of the soul of good and the soul of evil identified with Gnostic and Christian philosophy, with the nature of good and evil everywhere. Mere learning, indeed, even though extensive and extraordinary, is, though necessary, but a small part of the subject, seeing he ought to be versed in the views, sentiments, figures, light and darkness, literature and philosophy of the East. He ought to know the idioms of these principal languages as well as his own ; non verbum e verbo merely, sed sensum exprimere de sensu, as Jerome remarks ; to be capable of remarking easily the different styles of the different writers of the Testament, so as to distinguish the false from the true books ; and what is even more difficult, the forgeries which have been introduced into the middle or appended to the end of Paul's Epistles, a task by no means easy ; to be well versed in the Hebrew Scriptures, perfectly acquainted with their drift and tenour, capable of seeing at a glance the differences between the historic and the dramatic, the real and the figurative.

### *The Cause of the Translation of Galatians.*

After translating all the Epistles of the Testament, for the purpose of knowing the style of Paul and the gospel which he preached, I found Galatians to be one of the most undoubted of this learned apostle. It does not, however, appear to me to be perfect. It being short was there-

fore likely to give less labour than the Epistle of Romans, and at the same time exhibit the gospel and some of the horrid errors and glaring absurdities of the legalized version. The truth is, however, you cannot translate one Epistle without translating the whole. In consequence, however, of the total perversion of Christianity, the monstrous heresy which is now preached under this name, and the equally monstrous representations of the style of Paul, it was judged commendable to translate a part of the undoubted, very important, but difficult Epistle of Romans.

### *Observations on the Translation.*

Here little, comparatively speaking, can be said on this extensive subject. Difficulties, however, of no small magnitude, are frequently in the way. I have kept closely to the Greek, yet the translation will be found to be in general not only free and good, but often excellent, and even elegant; not, however, more so than the original. In some places I have been happy, but failed in others from the incapacity of the English to express the Greek, yet no modern language in Europe is better fitted for this purpose. Both languages, the unlearned should be told, are very differently constructed, and present peculiar idioms. The Greek is not only infinitely more perfect in its verbs, but in its whole fabrication. In this respect it resembles the perfection of the Sanskrit. Hence the negative idea, *not, in, or less* in composition, as *heartless* of our language, is expressed in Greek and Sanskrit by a single letter, thus:

धर्म signifies *justice*, with अ prefixed, अ धर्म *injustice*; Greek, δικη, or δικια, *justice*; α-δικια, *in-justice*.

### *The Middle Voice of the Greek Verbs.*

The middle voice of the Greek verbs is a very important consideration. It is, however, directly opposed to the passive. The spelling of several tenses of both voices is si-



milar, which, unless the sense is consulted, may be easily confounded. Where the sense therefore sanctions the middle voice sense, I have expressed the idea. The freedom and responsibility of man are particularly pressed upon the reader by the Apostle Paul. Hence his frequent use of the middle voice in his Epistles. Hence, μετατιθεσθε, though both externally middle and passive, is translated by me *remove yourselves*; but in reference to those examples, about which there can be no doubt, such as, ευηγγελισαμεθα, ανεθεμην, προεπηγγειλατο, the translation always expresses this idea. Even towards ημην, the same idea is preserved.

### *The more important Matters.*

It will be as well, however, to notice the more important matters and differences between my translation and the legalized one, differences which might indeed be divided into the essentials and non-essentials. The following passage is entitled to be considered among the essential differences.

### *The beginning of the second Chapter of Galatians.*

<i>My Translation.</i>	<i>The Greek.</i>	<i>The legalized Translation.</i> <i>The Douay is similar.</i>
Afterwards in the course however of PROBABLY FOUR years, I went up to Jerusalem with Bar Nabas, taking also Titus with [me]. I went up however by a revelation and explained the gospel myself to them which I preach among the Gentiles, in private however to those of consideration, not by any means when I should run or have run into PUBLIC; BUT WHERE HOW-	Ἐπειτα δια ΔΕ ΚΑ ΤΕΣΣΑΡΩΝ ἔτων ἀνέβην εἰς Ἱερουσόλυμα μετὰ Βαρ Ναβα, συμπαραλαβὼν καὶ Τίτον. Ἀνέβην δὲ κατὰ ἀποκαλύψιν, καὶ ἀνέθιμην αὐτοῖς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὃ κηρύσσω ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι· κατ' ἰδίαν δὲ τοῖς δοκουσι, μὴ πως εἰς ΚΑΙΝΟΝ τρέχω ἢ ἄραμον· ἀλλ' ΟΤ ΔΕ ΤΙΤΟΣ ὁ σὺν μοι, ΕΛΛΗΝ ὢν, ἠναγκάσθη περιτμηθῆναι· δια δὲ τοὺς παριστατοὺς ψευδαδιλ-	Then FOURTEEN years after I went up again to Jerusalem with Barnabas and took Titus with [me] also. And I went up by revelation, and communicated unto them that gospel which I preach among the Gentiles, but privately to them which were of reputation, lest by any means I should run or had run IN VAIN. But neither Titus, who was with me, BEING A GREEK, was

*My Translation.*

EVER Titus, who was with me, THOUGH a GREEK, was compelled to be circumcised, in consequence however of *sneaking*, lying brethren, who crept in to observe the freedom which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might enslave us; to whom WHERE HOWEVER we yielded temporary submission, that the truth of the gospel might continue with you. From those however who appeared to be of some consequence whatever they formerly were, I differ nothing—God accepts not the face of a man—for they of consequence DID NOT CONSIDER THEMSELVES RESPONSIBLE to me; but on the contrary, seeing that I TRUTHED the gospel of the uncircumcision as much as Peter [did] that of he uncircumcision.

*The Greek.*

φανς αὐτοῖς παρασπῶν κατασκευῆσαι τὴν εὐθυρίαν ἡμῶν, ἡν ἔχομεν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ἵνα ἡμᾶς καταδουλώσονται, ὡς ὅΤΙ ΔΕ πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἔξαμιν τῇ ὑποτάξει, ἵνα ἡ ἀλήθεια τοῦ εὐαγγελίου διαμῖνῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς. Ἀπο δὲ τῶν δοκούντων ἵνα τι, ὅποιον ποτε ἦσαν, οὐδὲν μοι διαφέρει· προσώπων θείας ἀνθρώπου οὐ λαμβάνω· ἡμῶν γὰρ οἱ δοκούντες οὐδὲν προσανθίοντο, ἀλλὰ τουναντίον, ἰδόντες ὅτι πιστιστικῶς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς ἀκροβυστίας καθὼς Πίτρος τῆς περιτομῆς.

*The legalized Translation.*

compelled to be circumcised: And that because of false brethren *unawares brought in*, who came in privily to spy out our liberty, which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into bondage: To whom WE GAVE PLACE BY SUBJECTION, NO, NOT FOR AN HOUR; that the truth of the gospel might continue with you. But of those who seemed to be somewhat, whatsoever they were, it maketh no matter to me: God accepteth NO MAN'S PERSON: for they who seemed [to be somewhat] IN CONFERENCE ADDED NOTHING TO ME. But contrariwise, when they saw that the gospel of the uncircumcision was COMMITTED UNTO ME as [the gospel] of the circumcision [was] to Peter.

The Greek text has not been altered. The reader is referred to the note on this passage in Galatians. The only difference is the word ΠΑΛΙΝ, which has been left out, not because it does not exist in some Greek copies, or because it ought not to exist, but for the purpose of inviting attention to the consideration of the word—if it is proper to speak in this manner to men who preach falsehoods for money—for it means not merely *again*, but *backwards*, or a *return*. Hence, ΠΑΛΙΝ ὑπεστρεψα εἰς Δαμασκον, I returned BACK to Damascus, is the best of renderings. Many examples of the same meaning might

be given from the Classics. The following is one from Euripides :

Οὐκ ἀφ' ἡμῶν, οὐκ ἀπ' οἰκῶν  
ΠΑΛΙΝ ἀνα, μεθεμένα κτυποῦ  
Ποδα σὸν εἰλιξεις ;

### ΔΕΚΑΤΕΣΣΑΡΩΝ.

The simple process of arriving at the truth in reference to the number of years—FOUR—for—FOURTEEN—is merely the division of ΔΕΚΑΤΕΣΣΑΡΩΝ into three words, thus, ΔΕ ΚΑ ΤΕΣΣΑΡΩΝ, which is in English, HOWEVER, PROBABLY FOUR ; a reading which, while it removes the doubts of fifteen hundred years' standing, harmonizes as a matter of course with the context and other parts of scripture, with in particular the ninth chapter of the Acts. This journey of Paul to Jerusalem cannot by any possibility agree with the fifteenth chapter of Acts. Semler says in his comment on this passage, *διὰ δεκατεσσαρῶν ἐτῶν* : *Levius est illud, sive explicetur, μετὰ, post annos 14, elapsos, sive, interjectis fere 14 annis. Sed illud est longe majus et difficilius discrimen, quod OMNES INTERPRETES, VETUSTOS et NOVOS, LONGO INTERVALLO SEJUNGIT : utrum antiquissima sit hæc lectio, quæ numerat annos xiv. an vero olim fuerit tanquam QUATUOR ? De qua re jam in prolegomenis egimus copiosius : quomodo ille numerus designandus sit ? utrum ducatur ab anno eodem a quo cap. i. 8. numerantur tres anni ? utrum isti tres includantur, et fiant proprie 17, uti Hieronymus computavit. In what a labyrinth of inexplicable difficulties has this ΔΕΚΑΤΕΣΣΑΡΩΝ involved the commentators ! What rejoicings therefore should there be, O ye Christians, among you at home in consequence of this discovery, from the very Fretum Britannicum to ancient Thule ? and abroad, from the Fretum Herculeum to Scythia extra Imaum ? from, in short, Oceanus Eous to Oceanus Atlanticus ? It appears from the nineteenth of the ninth of Acts, that Paul after*

his conversion remained sometime *ἡμέρας τινὰς* in Damascus with the disciples; that he left Damascus to go into Arabia, and returned back to Damascus, where he continued *ἡμέρας ἱκανὰς, καὶ συνέχυνε τοὺς Ἰουδαίους τοὺς κατοικοῦντας* there; that he preached the Messiah to be the son of God; that his success was so considerable, as to cause a disturbance among the Jews; that after this he repaired to Syria and Cilicia, from which he appears to have gone to Jerusalem *κατέσσεσθων*, ABOUT FOUR years after his conversion, forming his first journey to this city. This correction, consequently, is not merely a literary, but a historical subject of great importance. It casts light on the early state of the Christian dispensation. It throws of course the chronological accounts of learned men into disorder, which, however, never were or ever could be in a state of order; for the whole false Christian world is divided on this celebrated journey of Paul. Hitherto the subject has been a chaos, from which, like all false and conflicting things, nothing definite could ever be gathered. Even those who appear to cling with great pertinacity to the side of the question, that Paul refers to the fifteenth chapter of Acts, exhibit a great and senseless wavering, unbecoming a subject of undoubted truth. Hence they, like all waverers, manifest a disposition to seize upon the most trifling and doubtful appearances of support. Ingenuity, conceit, and circumscribed verbal acquirements, called great learning, have in many instances taken the precedence of literature and deep intuition, which may be born and propagated, but never acquired. Nowhere does this appear more striking than in the commentaries on the scriptures. True, few books, in consequence of their antiquity, the destruction of ancient manuscripts, the number and variety of languages, the modes of thought and change of expressions introduced in the course of ages, the great responsibility, are more difficult to manage than the Greek Testament. None will feel this more strongly than they who are best qualified for the task. On this topic there are

many who, though they talk much, communicate little knowledge. They darken instead of enlightening. If a part, which requires more learning and intuition than ingenuity and verbosity, come in their way, they shuffle out of it more dexterously than wisely, leaving, it may be, their hearers or readers wondering after them, but as well informed at the termination as the beginning of their harangues. "Either," says Paley, "this was the journey described in the fifteenth chapter of the Acts, when Paul and Barnabas were sent from Antioch to Jerusalem to consult the apostles and elders upon the question of the Gentile converts, or it was some journey of which the history does not take notice. If the first opinion be followed, the discrepancy in the two accounts is so considerable, that it is not without difficulty they can be adapted to the same transaction."

## KA.

KA, *perhaps, about, probably*, a Doric particle, is nearly equivalent to the Attic *av*. Though of course extensively used by the Doric writers, it is not, however, confined to them. This particle is not much known among our Greek lexicons. It does not even exist in Schrevilius, Jones, Groves, Dunbar, or Hederic. The Doric dialect, of which *ka* forms so prominent a place here, was spoken by a great number and variety of the Greeks, particularly of Asia Minor, and several of the islands, such as Crete, Rhodes, Corcyra. Paul was a native of Tarsus, a city of Asia Minor, near the coast, opposite the eastern coast of the island Cyprus. In ancient accounts, historical details and pastoral descriptions, the Doric dialect of Greece stands high. Paul uses also, in Galatians, the Ionic; hence, *ovκ ENI δουλος*. KA will be a new word for the lexicon men of the New Testament to introduce into their lexicons. Aristophanes, Ephicharmus, Bion, Theocritus, Plato, and others, wrote in this dialect. See the note on this passage.

Hermann, who has written on the particle *av*, might have noticed *κα*, as it stands so nearly related to this word.

### TO KAINON.

*Καινον* is another new Greek word for the lexicon men of the New Testament. Indeed it is almost unknown even to other Greek lexicons of some note. This word is highly worthy of a place among the essentials. The *δε κα τεσσαρων* might perhaps be classed exclusively among facts, the TO KAINON among facts and doctrine. The difference between RUNNING IN VAIN and running INTO PUBLIC, or the Kainon, is astounding and confounding. When moreover this running in vain is coupled, as it is, with a previous experience of the gospel and himself of, according to the vulgar version, SEVENTEEN YEARS, what a look of surprise must seize every one that contemplates the striking inconsistency. The surprise, however, is increased to wonder, when to this chronological experience is added the change of life and habits and manners and views which result from conversion. When, moreover, we hear Paul declaring positively, with an air more of the solemnity of eternity than time, his conversion to be the consequence not of some cold, philosophic dogma, which, like many of the pseudo-philosophers of the present day, he was circulating for his own selfish purposes, but of a revelation from God, our wonder becomes astonishment. Besides his utter abandonment of his former associates, his sovereign contempt and pity for the motives and modes of action of mankind, his declared positive irresponsibility to their tribunal as a seat of justice, his consequent appeal fixed and certain to the judgment-seat of heaven and the tribunal of God for the rectitude of his motives and the holiness of his cause; all these, we say, men of Christendom, Trinitarians and Unitarians, Protestant or Roman, not only surround Paul, if we madly cling to your nonsensical, monstrous reading, with a something entirely inexplicable, but throw us, who.

contemplate the scene at this remote period, into utter amazement! All this, in short, cannot be got over except by those who are prepared to swallow every contradiction; except by those who can make straight lines meet, or prove that a part is greater than the whole. To such, no absurdity, however monstrous, can disturb their creed, arrest their attention, or stop their progress. A barrier, a thousand feet high, is a molehill in their estimation, over which they leap with the agility of a magician. They would not be convinced though one rose from the dead! We however rise with delight and ecstasy from our amazement when informed that the reading is not KENON, but KAINON, on the authority of the oldest or reputed oldest manuscript in Europe. No sense, therefore, or reasoning, common or extraordinary—which, however, is at all times and in all places necessary for a translator—is here particularly requisite for a demonstration of the truth: nevertheless it ought to be maintained, that sense and learning, even without the aid of a manuscript, might have been able to detect the false reading of the printed text. Even we ourselves, be it known to you, marked the passage for this very purpose. Without this authority, however, there are several minor collateral aids in favour of the true reading, which, as a matter of course, without any difficulty, may be gathered from the context and internal evidence, over which we pass, pointing merely to the contrast of the PRIVATE with the PUBLIC running.

*The Philological Circumstances of the Το Καινον.*

In addition to what is said in the note on the *Καινον*, it may be remarked, that the *Καινον* was a hall in the ΔΙΚΑΣΤΗΡΙΩ, of which there were four, the *Παραβυστος*, *Καινον*, *Τριγωνος*, *Μεσος*. Some use *Melychium* for *Medio*, and *Helixæam* for *Kaino*. *Melychium* is composed of מלך, a *king*, and עם, the *people*, a place for the government of the people. Δικαστηριον is composed of δίκη,

justice, and *στηρ* or *שׁוּ*, Hebrew word in Greek letters, which signifies a *præfect* or *judge*, a *moderator*, one that *presides over the public business*; also, one that *carries the staff before the judge*. This Hebrew word *שׁוּ* is often joined, as the word *δικη* is to *στηρ*, with the corresponding word *שׁוּשׁ*, *justice*, *judge*. On the *δικαστηρια*, Hesychius says, *Αθηνησιν Αρειος παγος κρινει τα φονικα, ειτα η βουλη των πεντακοσιων· επι παλλαδιω δε των ακουσιων εδικαζοντο, ειτ' επι δελφινιω εδικαζετο τοις ομολογουσιν ανησκειναι μεν, λεγουσι δε εννομως, και το εν πρυτανειω*. Pollux, speaking of the *Δικαστηριον* and the judgments given there, says, *Και τας του φονου δικας [Ο Βασιλευς] εις Αρειον παγον εισαγει· και τον στεφανον αποθεμενος συν αυτοις δικαζει*—*et lites de cæde in Areopagum rex introducit ac, deposita corona, cum ipsis judicat*.

#### ΟΥ ΔΕ.

No part, however, of this translation is more satisfactory or striking than the correction of ΟΥ ΔΕ, *WHERE HOWEVER*, referring obviously to Jerusalem, the local celebration of the rite of Titus—*Ελληνων, ηναγκασθη περιτμηθηναι, though a Greek was compelled to be circumcised*; and the reason is assigned, *δια δε, in consequence, however, τους παρεισακτους ψευδαδελφους, of sneaking false brethren, οιτινες παρεισηλθον κατασκοπησαι, who crept in to observe*. Nothing can be more evident than the sense and propriety of the reading. In two or three codices, *μη* follows *ινα*, which, if we admit, it would read well thus: *But where however Titus, who was with me, though a Greek, was compelled to be circumcised, in consequence, however, of sneaking false brethren, who crept in to observe the freedom, which we have in Christ Jesus, LEST they might enslave us*; ος ΟΥ ΔΕ, *to whom, where however*—still keeping up the train of thought, *the locality of Jerusalem—ειξαμεν we yielded προς ωραν temporary τη υποταγη submission*.



*The Condition of Ancient Manuscripts.*

The condition of ancient manuscripts presents the easiest solution in the world for the false reading to ignorant, unlearned men, when it is considered that no accents, nor division of letters or words, existed in those days; when it is considered, moreover, that great legal opposition as well as private scandal and persecution must in malice have been applied to Christianity, without having recourse to history for its confirmation. It must not, however, be passed over in silence, that the vulgar, horrid reading did not appear to Tertullian so much the consequence of a simple misconstruction as a *decided vitiation* of the Greek text, for he calls it—*VITIATIO*! Jam pergit Tertullianus: intendamus enim [i. e. licet sciam aliter alios hic legere] et sensui ipsi et causæ ejus, et apparebit *vitiatio scripturæ*. His Latin is: *sed nec Titus, qui mecum erat, cum esset Græcus, coactus est circumcidi*; which is the common translation. The common French reads thus: Et meme on n' obligea point Tite qui etait avec moi, a se faire circoncire, quoique fut Grec. Wiclif is, “and neither Tite that hadde be with me while he was hethene was compellid to be circuncidid, but for false bretheren that weren yn whiche hadden entrid.”

*The Western or Roman Section discredits Paul's Epistles.*

The Western section, moreover, of false Christians have always wished to throw some discredit upon Paul and his Epistles. Peter and the Catholic Epistles, as they are very improperly called, have ever been praised up to the skies and placed before this great man's writings. We shall by-and-by examine the authority of these Epistles, particularly those of Peter. The second Epistle of Peter does not exist in the Syriac, and the first I do not consider CANONICAL. The first Epistle of Peter, I believe, is a FORGERY. Now,

ye Western Roman and Protestant sections, come forward against this authority and you shall be heard in reply.

### MH ΠΩΣ.

*Μη πως*, rendered *not by any means when*, or as it might be, *not when*. A very interesting dissertation might be written on *πως*. The Greek language is but little understood, notwithstanding all the cultivation which it appears to receive: its particles less than the general language. *Πως* alone, as well as preceded by *μη*, cannot be properly examined in this place. From an ignorance of *πως*, many of the classic authors' expressions are totally misrepresented. Difficulties, however, attend the subject. It appears to be used sometimes like a noun with the article *το* before it. *Και εξητουν*, says Luke, *οι αρχιερεις και οι γραμματεις ΤΟ ΠΩΣ ανελωσιν αυτον*, And the chief priests and the scribes sought *the when* they might destroy him. *Εισηλθε δε ο Σατανας εις Ιουδαν τον επικαλουμενον Ισκαριωτην, οντα εκ του αριθμου των δωδεκα · και απελθων συνελαλησε τοις αρχιερευσι και τοις στρατηγοις ΤΟ ΠΩΣ αυτον παραδω αυτοις*; that is, Satan however entered into Judas, surnamed Iscariot, *THOUGH* of the number of the twelve: and having gone he conversed with the chief priests and captains on *THE WHEN* [or *opportunity when*] he might betray him to them. In the next verse, it is said, that Judas sought *ευκαιριαν* a *good opportunity* του παραδουναι αυτον to betray him. The *το πως* might be considered as explained by *ευκαιριαν*. I have translated *πως ουν ελογισθη*, *when*—I see no other meaning for the word in this passage, which occurs in Romans.

### *Romans.*

The short space left for the Introduction prevents me from dwelling longer on Galatians. The Epistle of Paul to the Romans is very important, literary, philosophical. It has, however, been much abused and corrupted. About

four chapters at the end are not Paul's; they have been forged for unjust, unholy purposes. Marcion rejected a portion of this Epistle, but I have been unable to ascertain positively how much. Schmidt, and another learned man of Germany, whose works I have not read, talk, I believe, of one or two chapters at the termination being composed of scraps of Paul's sentences. Moses Stuart, of America, who has published under Tegg, of London, a large volume on this Epistle, supports the whole sixteen chapters; but unfortunately he is neither scholar sufficient to pass an opinion on the subject, nor does he understand the scriptures. A number of names introduced into these chapters has been added to support a historical lie, which by-and-by we shall give to the winds.

### *Philosophy of Paul.*

No man, be he who he may, can excel Paul in the physics and philosophy of the intellectual and moral existence of man. His reasoning is excellent and exceedingly close. His ideas and sentiments are extremely just, grand, noble. He buries in the dust the external decorations of the beau and the belle, the trifling gewgaws of the prince and the monarch, the mad conceit of the proud, and the unmerited applause of the multitudes. Before him and his gospel each individual stands naked and alone, viewed like God himself, only through his works and form of existence. Jew and Gentile, learned and unlearned, are, apart from this gospel, alike to him. His Christianity and philosophy meet as well the swindling and deformity of the knave, as the beauty, simplicity, and innocence of the good. Εἰ δὲ ἡ ἀδικία ἡμῶν Θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην συνίστησι, τί ἐροῦμεν; μὴ ἀδικὸς ὁ Θεός, ὁ ἐπιφέρων τὴν ὀργήν; *If our injustice constitutes,* says he, *God's justice, is God who inflicts retribution unjust?* This is not the place, however, for investigating this noble subject. Where he has been most miserably represented by the vulgar version, let us give



The other passage is from chap. iv. 9, presenting in the legalized version a translation false and scandalous in the highest degree, disgraceful to an ignorant school, much more to the *men of Oxford and Cambridge, who preach up this abominable ignorance as literature*, and talk highly of Greek learning.

### My Translation.

For we affirm that the truth became to Abraham justice. When therefore did it become? In the state of circumcision or uncircumcision? Not in circumcision, but in uncircumcision. He even took the rite of circumcision, a seal of the justice of the truth, which exists in the uncircumcision AFTER he was [the] father of all that believe during uncircumcision—AFTER the imputation of the justice even to them, even a father of circumcision to those not of circumcision only, but also to those that walk in the steps of the truth of our father Abraham in the state of uncircumcision. Hence the declaration to Abraham or his seed, that he is the heir of the world [comes] not through the law, but through the justice of the truth. For if they of the law [ARE] heirs, the truth is useless, and the declaration destroyed. The law verily works destruction. Where,

### The Greek.

Λιγομιεν γαρ, οτι ιλογισθη τω Αβρααμ η πιστις υς δικαιοσυνη. Πως ουν ιλογισθη; Εν περιτομη εντι η εν ακροβυστια; Ουκ εν περιτομη, αλλ' εν ακροβυστια. Και σημειον ιλαβη περιτομης, σφραγιδα της δικαιοσυνης της πιστιως της εν τη ακροβυστια, υς το νυναι αυτον πατερα παντων των πιστευοντων δι' ακροβυστίας—υς το λογισθηναι και αυτους την δικαιοσυνην—και πατερα περιτομης τωις ουν εν περιτομη μονοι, αλλα και τοις στοιχειωσι τοις ιχνυσι της εν ακροβυστια πιστιως του πατρος ημων Αβρααμ. Ου γαρ δια νομου η σωτηρια τω Αβρααμ, η τω σπειρματι αυτου, το πληρονομον αυτον νυναι του κοσμου αλλα δια δικαιοσυνης πιστιως. Ει γαρ υ εκ νομου, πληρονομοι, κενυνωσται η πιστις, και καταργηται η σωτηρια. Ο γαρ νομος εργην καταργαζισται· ου δε ουν υστι νομοι, ουδε παραβασις.

### The legalized Translation.

For we say that faith was reckoned to Abraham for righteousness. How was it then reckoned? When he was in circumcision or in uncircumcision? Not in circumcision, but in uncircumcision. And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith *which [he had yet] being uncircumcised: THAT HE MIGHT BE the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised; THAT RIGHTEOUSNESS MIGHT BE IMPUTED* unto them also: and the father of circumcision to them who are not of the circumcision only, but who also walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham, which [he had] *being [yet] uncircumcised*. For the promise *THAT HE SHOULD BE* the heir of the world [was] not to Abraham, or to his seed, through the law, but through the righteousness of faith. For if they [which are] of the law

<i>My Translation.</i>	<i>The Greek.</i>	<i>The legalized Translation.</i>
however, there is not a law, neither [is] there a transgression. Therefore [it is] of the truth, nevertheless a gratuity; after the nature of the firm declaration to all the seed, not to the [son] of the law only, but also to the [son] of the truth of Abraham, who is [the] father of us all. . . . who FROM hope to hope believed AFTER he made [or became] himself a father.	Δια τουτο <i>εσ</i> πιστις, <i>ινα</i> κατα <i>χαριν</i> , <i>υς</i> το <i>υπαι</i> βιβαιαν την <i>επαγγελιαν</i> παντι <i>τω</i> <i>σπερμωτι</i> , <i>ου</i> <i>τω</i> <i>εσ</i> του <i>νομου</i> <i>μονου</i> , <i>αλλα</i> <i>και</i> <i>τω</i> <i>εσ</i> πιστις <i>Αβρααμ</i> , <i>ος</i> <i>ιστι</i> <i>πατηρ</i> <i>παντων</i> <i>ημων</i> . . . . <i>ος</i> <i>παρ'</i> <i>ελπιδα</i> <i>εσ'</i> <i>ελπις</i> <i>πιστις</i> <i>υς</i> <i>το</i> <i>γινωσκει</i> <i>αυτου</i> <i>πατερα</i> .	[be] heirs, faith is made void, and the promise made of none effect: because the law worketh wrath: for where no law is there [is] no transgression. Therefore it is of faith, that [IT MIGHT BE] by grace; TO THE END the promise MIGHT be sure to all the seed; not to that only which [is] of the law, but to that also which [is] of the faith of Abraham; who is the father of us all. . . . who AGAINST hope belived IN hope THAT HE MIGHT BECOME the father.

From this specimen, even the ignorant and the unlearned may easily see the horrid, bungling nature of the legalized translation. The number of words supplied to make sense is abominable; and yet it is nonsense after all. I have rendered one of the *γὰρ*'s *verily*; but this is not a very essential point.

### *The Emphasis of Paul.*

It is but justice to say, that the emphatic Greek of Paul has not been always exhibited in my translation of Galatians and Romans. When Paul, for example, says, *εγω παρα ανθρωπου παρελαβον αυτο*, he here uses the pronoun *ΕΓΩ*, *I*, emphatically, which should have been marked in the translation with *Italic type*.

### *The word—Born—applied to the Messiah.*

In the first chapter of Romans I have rendered *του γενομενου* *born*. The birth, however, here pressed upon the attention of the reader is not the common birth. The word

is used in the sense of the Word *made* itself flesh. It is no less than the birth of the God *born*, *God in* or *with us*—the God with the animal, selfish nature of man—a word, which is rendered by the Old Testament, *Immanuel*. This Word, the God made flesh, constitutes the first Adam, who was the son of God. The earthly Adam, however, had a son *born* in his likeness. Marcion, I believe, took the same course, which introduces us to the Great Historical Question.

### *The Great Historical Question.*

It is not, however, my intention to say much on the great historical question, which this subject presents to the astonished view of the multitude. The element of God is truth, which it is our duty and interest to support. The number, however, of the forgeries with which this subject is mixed up, is amazing, of which common and even extraordinary Christians have no idea. Endless are the volumes which have been written on this question, which cannot even be named. Paley, however, stands forth, or is set forth in our country, as a sort of champion of the false Messiah; but even Paley has no claim upon us as a Greek and Eastern scholar, which the subject requires, even if we admit that he practised God according to his knowledge. Paley, however, it may be observed, with Dr. Chalmers, does not exhibit much of the moral religious spirit, which we are warranted to expect from the nature of his work. The author, indeed, was not a man of this character; nor do we think that after all he has written on the subject of Christianity, he displays much belief in the existence of the false Messiah. Chalmers says in his Lectures on Paley, that his work on the evidences of Christianity is chiefly to be valued on account of one species of evidence—the Historical, of which, adds he, it gives a *most satisfactory compend*. In reply we have only to say, that if a compend and a digest of the forgeries and sayings of

comparatively modern times, taken from others without investigation, who in turn have taken theirs from others without investigation and research, be satisfactory, his work on that part of the historical evidence of the false Messiah, to which we refer, is very satisfactory. But, in short, it is no authority whatever on the essential historical evidence. Dr. Chalmers, you must reverse your verdict. Your whole subject of the false Messiah, is a horrid, monstrous, atheistic forgery.

### *Josephus.*

The oldest writer, who has been often quoted on this forgery, is Josephus. Paley, in his historical wisdom, has thought proper to quote the same author in proof of the existence of the false Messiah. The reputed passage of this Jew on the description of the Christ of Judea is the following, which we quote in full from the printed work under the name of Josephus: Γίνεται δε κατα τουτον τον χρονον, Ιησους, ΣΟΦΟΣ ΑΝΗΡ ειγε ΑΝΔΡΑ ΑΥΤΟΝ ΛΕΓΕΙΝ ΧΡΗ. Ην ΓΑΡ παραδοξων εργων ΠΟΙΗΤΗΣ, διδασκαλος ανθρωπων των ηδονη ταληθη δεχομενων, και πολλους μεν Ιουδαιους, πολλους δε και Ελληνικους επηγαγετο. Ο ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ ΟΥΤΟΣ ΗΝ· και αυτον ενδεξει των πρωτων ανδρων παρ' ημιν, σταυρω επιτετιμηκοτος Πιλατου, ουκ επαυσαντο οιγε πρωτον αυτον αγαπησαντες· εφανη ΓΑΡ αυτοις τριτην εχων ημεραν ΠΑΛΙΝ ζων, των θειων προφητων ταυτα και αλλα μυρια θαυμασια περι αυτου ειρηκοτων· Εις τε νυν των χριστιανων απο του δε ωνομασμενων ουκ επελιπε το φυλον. Paley admits that the authenticity of this passage has been long disputed; but he adds ignorantly and *deviously* enough, that "it may with great reason be contended ΕΙΤΗΚΕ that the passage is genuine, or that the silence of Josephus was designed." Is this the course which you should have taken, Paley, to pass over a passage of this momentous importance? Call you this, Dr. Chalmers, the becoming manner in which a



subject of this historical quality should be treated and criticised? Is there no internal evidence connected with the passage and the Jew, worthy of notice in the scale of evidence, which Paley should have forced upon his readers? Are there no manuscripts of antiquity to be weighed in the balances of criticism? Are they destroyed for the purpose of giving currency to the imposition, so that the modern manuscripts and printed books cannot be confronted with the ancient? If a passage so desirable as this of Josephus had ever existed, would not some old manuscripts have been preserved with singular care? Would they not have been inclosed in cases of gold, and treasured up in our libraries and museums with all the pomp which belongs to a subject of so great value to the authors of this Messiah? The truth is, a man that writes like Paley on a topic of this sort, is unfit for a historian. With men of sense and justice and learning, there can be but one opinion on the passage. Talk of the silence of Josephus being designed as the only other alternative to the solution of the question!! What ignorance and childishness, if something else, decidedly vicious, may not be surmised! It is, indeed, impossible for any honest, sensible, learned man to harbour a doubt of the rascality of this passage.

I have seen several manuscripts of Josephus at the British Museum, and one in the library of the Duke of Sussex, but their antiquity is not great. A manuscript of two, four, or five hundred years, carries with it little weight. There is only one manuscript of this author in the Bodleian of the fourteenth century, in Greek; for this information I am indebted to Dr. Bandinel, of the Bodleian. I would have gone to Oxford to examine it, if it had been of an earlier date. This manuscript is consequently not older than the time of Wiclif.

*Tacitus.*

The author that stands next to Josephus on the subject

of Christianity, is Tacitus. The question, however, between the false and the true Christ, is, not whether there are any Latin historians or writers that speak of the existence of Christians or Christianity, but whether any of them supports the *corporeal existence of an individual confined exclusively to Judea*. Tacitus, after noticing the consequences attending the burning of Rome in the time of Nero, observes, *sed non ope humana, non largitionibus principis aut deum placamentis, decedebat infamia, quin jussum incendium crederetur. Ergo abolendo rumori Nero subdidit reos, et quæsitissimis poenis affecit, quos per flagitia invisos, vulgus Christianos appellabat. Auctor nominis ejus Christus, qui Tiberio imperitante per procuratorem Pontium Pilatum supplicio affectus erat*. Repressaque in præsens exitiabilis superstitio rursus erumpebat non modo per Judæam originem ejus mali, sed per urbem etiam, quo cuncta undique atrocia aut pudenda confluunt celebranturque. I have marked with italic the sentence which I maintain to be a forgery, though I have also some doubt of *repressaque in præsens*. In Dr. Lardner's quotation, there is no *que* to *repressa*. Whence did he take the passage? I have examined all the chief printed editions of Tacitus; some have and some have not *qui post Christus*. Brotier's edition, which is considered good, has none. It appears also that the passage immediately preceding this interpolation has been patched, for the Jesuit Brotier says, that *vero* is to be found before *rumori*, but he adds that it must have been inserted by some Christian librarian. He does not say it was a forgery. *We know*, however, what this jesuit is, from a Supplement to the Fifth Book of the Annals, which he himself wrote, as he tells us in a note, what Tacitus omitted in its proper place: thus, *Cum Romana civitas in sui internecionem ita fureret scelus unum, portentosa mala erupturum patravere Hierosolyma Pontius Pilatus, quem Cæsar Judææ procuratorem fecerat non vecors, imbellis tamen, Jesum Christum novæ religionis auc-*


torem nullius criminis compertum mortæ adfecit. Diffusa saxa, concussa .....; and he continues this strain from the scriptures. From this we see how much reliance may be placed on the labours of the jesuit.

But even the clause *Tiberio imperitante* is given, a *Flor*, as wanting. The other part of the sentence might nevertheless exist; but this patch-work will not do for us! The oldest printed copy of the British Museum, dated outside 1467, without title-page or preface, reads: Ergo aboledo rumori Nero subdidit reos: & exq̄sitissis poeis affecit: quos p̄ flagitia iuisos vulgos xpianos appellabat. auctor nomis eius xpus Tiberio iperitate p̄ p̄cuatore Pontiu Pilatum supplicio affectus erat. repressaque in præsens exitiabilis superstitio rursu erupebat: non modo p̄ Iudea origine. There is no *qui* here, which of course agrees with Brotier.

In an Introduction to Justin Martyr, written more than a hundred years ago, by the editor, a man of considerable research, I see this passage actually quoted thus: Ergo abolendo rumori, Nero subdidit reos, et quæsitissimis poenis affecit quos per flagitia invisos vulgus Christianos appellabat. Exitialis superstitio rursus erumpebat non modo per Judæam originem ejus mali, sed per urbem etiam ..... But I see no reason why the author should have left out this sentence. However, after viewing this very sentence in all its bearings, in conjunction with the style and sense of Tacitus, I must insist upon this sentence being a forgery. There is moreover no occasion for a *second* allusion to the *author* or origin of this superstition, if you admit the first, for Tacitus says, *non modo per Judæam ORIGINEM ejus mali, sed per urbem*. Repressaque in præsens, about which however I do not contend, is a questionable clause. The British Museum is poor in manuscripts of this author. No. 8904, which belongs to the *additional* manuscripts in the Museum, was pointed out to me by Sir Frederick

Madden; it is in good condition, but of no antiquity.<sup>a</sup> There is only one manuscript of Tacitus in the Bodleian, but it belongs to the fifteenth century: consequently not of much value.

### *Pliny.*

There is nothing in Pliny capable of being construed either for or against the false , Messiah. He merely asserts in general terms, that Christiani essent soliti stato die lucem convenire carmenque Christo quasi Deo, dicere secum invicem: seque sacramento non in scelus aliquod obstringere, sed ne furta, ne latrocinia, ne adulteria committerent, ne fidem fallerent.<sup>b</sup> But there is no necessity to pursue the Latin writers farther: there is, indeed, no other of which any particular notice is necessary. The importance however of the subject, merely in a historical point of view, demands a separate dissertation.

### *The Messiah among the Pseudo-Fathers.*

This subject has been already noticed. Be it remarked, however, that the forgeries here are horrid and immense, and exhibit a chain and concatenation of vagabonds, by whom the truth and its supporters have been in all ages disguised—disfigured—smothered—murdered. It is an abominable contemplation to be informed at the threshold of the subject, that no dependance can be placed on the Western Fathers, such as Irenæus, or even Tertullian. In the works of Justin Martyr and Irenæus, there are anecdotes—forged of course—related of the evangelists altogether disgraceful; such as *John leaping out of the bath when Cerinthus entered*. The Father might have made

---

<sup>a</sup> There are twenty or thirty manuscript folio volumes of catalogues of books in the Museum, without an index. Why is this? I was either obliged to wade through all these to find if any manuscripts of Tacitus existed among them, or apply to Sir Frederick Madden, who has the charge of the manuscripts.

<sup>b</sup> See the whole Epistle of Pliny, liber x.

a better anecdote of the Evangelist than this. Some ignoble Greek scholars and unlettered men tell us about the existence of the false Messiah in the Epistles of Paul, such as Corinthians. First prove to us that these Epistles are Paul's. We scout the passages brought forward on this subject, as the productions of lying ignorant men.

*The Septuagint and its Corruptions.*

A sentence or two ought to be said on the Septuagint, which derives its name from the number of translators said to have been employed on the work. It is a literary subject of great importance, for it contains many phrases and modes of Greek expression, translated from the same Hebrew phrases, which have been carried into the Greek Testament; but the consideration of the subject is too extensive for this place. This translation of the Hebrew scriptures into Greek is said to have been made more than two hundred years before the Christian era, under Ptolemy Philadelphus, King of Egypt. There is a Greek work under the name of Aristeas, on the Septuagint, giving an account of the translation of the Hebrew Bible into Greek under this Ptolemy; but the work is a forgery. The Septuagint is also said to be connected with Demetrius Phalerius, of whom we cannot here take notice. Bellarmine, a cardinal and a man of considerable learning, and perhaps more truth than is common to some of the Roman sect, declares in his Latin work, on the word of God, "though I am not ignorant that some are of opinion that the translation of the seventy has entirely perished, I think it much more probable that it still exists, but so *corrupted* and *vitiating* as to appear quite a different thing." Possinus, too, a man of the same sect, writing of the genealogy of the Christ, says, "such a [vis] power of corruption has been applied to this book, and from the earliest times so seized on all its parts, that to restore it to its primitive integrity, not merely human endeavours, but divine omnipotence appears necessary." However, it is not difficult to perceive that the style of the

books varies. The readings of different editions also exhibit variations. Take for example, *ρυσσασθαι τους χριστους σου*, of the third chapter of Hab, which our legalized version reads *for salvation with thine anointed*—the rendering of the Greek is, to deliver thy *Christs* or *elect*. To men of sense and learning, however, the light of the truth shines distinctly in what remains of the Septuagint.

### *The Holy Evangelist John.*

In consequence of the total misconstruction and representation of the holy Gospel of John, a short introductory dissertation on his style and wisdom has been added. I regret that more justice has not been done the subject. The limits, however, as well as the newness and laborious nature of the work sanction the propriety of the course. Enough, however, has been done to give the people, who love truth, some idea of the beautifully true and extraordinary nature of the gospel and Christianity. They will find here, however, explanations not to be found in the English language, nor, I believe, in any language in Europe. The true view of Christianity, is indeed remarkable. The more I contemplate the subject, the more am I struck with its truth, its very taste and sublimity; from which even the style, censured as it has been by the learned ignorant, cannot be separated. The Gospels and Paul's Epistles, Dr. Chalmers, have, though you assert the contrary, something more than even *truth for their recommendation*—an expression which you have employed on the subject. With a true knowledge of their contents, it is impossible to exclude even a considerable share of literary taste from the Gospel of John. Of this, the legalized version itself, even when it expresses the sense, gives the unlearned little indication. In other words, the more common literary arrangement is destroyed, of which the following passage is given as an illustration. Throughout, however, the whole translation of the gospels, the same state of things prevails.

*My Translation.*

After however these things, Joseph of Arimathea, THOUGH A DISCIPLE of Jesus, but concealed through fear of the Jews, asked Pilate that he might take the body of Jesus, and Pilate gave permission. He went therefore and took the body of Jesus. Nicodemus, however, who came the first to Jesus, by night also came, bringing a mixture of myrrh and aloes about a hundred pound weight. They took then the body of Jesus and bound it in linen clothes with the spices, as the Jews are accustomed to embalm. There was, however, in the place where he was crucified a garden; and in the garden a new sepulchre, in which none indeed was even ever laid. There therefore in consequence of the parascave of the Jews, because the sepulchre was near, they laid Jesus.

ON THE ONE HOWEVER OF THE SABBATHS, Mary Magdalene comes early, *when* yet dark, to the sepulchre; and sees the stone taken away from the sepulchre. She runs there-

*The Douay or Roman.*

AND after these things Joseph of Arimathea, BECAUSE HE WAS A DISCIPLE of Jesus, but secretly for fear of the Jews, besought Pilate that he might take away the body of Jesus. And Pilate gave leave. He came therefore and took away the body of Jesus. And Nicodemus also came, he who at the first came to Jesus by night, bringing a mixture of myrrh and aloes, about one hundred pound-weight. They took therefore the body of Jesus, and bound it in linen cloths with the spices, as the manner of the Jews is to bury. Now there was in the place where he was crucified, a garden; and in the garden a new sepulchre, wherein no man yet had been laid. There therefore, because of the parascave of the Jews, they laid Jesus, because the sepulchre was nigh at hand.

AND ON THE FIRST day of the week, Mary Magdalen cometh early, when it was yet dark, into the sepulchre; and she saw the stone taken away from

*The legalized Translation.*

AND after this Joseph of Arimathea, BEING A DISCIPLE of Jesus, but secretly for fear of the Jews, besought Pilate that he might take away the body of Jesus: and Pilate gave [him] leave. He came therefore, and took the body of Jesus. And there came also Nicodemus, which at the first came to Jesus by night, and brought a mixture of myrrh and aloes, about an hundred pound weight. Then took they the body of Jesus, and wound it in linen clothes with the spices, as the manner of the Jews is to bury. Now in the place where he was crucified, there was a garden; and in the garden a new sepulchre, wherein was never man yet laid. There laid they Jesus therefore, because of the Jews' preparation [day]; for the sepulchre was nigh at hand.

The FIRST [day] of THE WEEK cometh Mary Magdalen early, when it was yet dark, unto the sepulchre, and seeth the stone taken away from the sepulchre. Then she

*My Translation.*

fore and comes to Simon Peter, and to the other disciple whom Jesus loved, and says to them; They have taken away the Lord out of the sepulchre, and we know not where they have laid him. Peter therefore and the other disciple went out and came to the sepulchre. The two however ran together, and the other disciple *ran faster* than Peter, and came first to the sepulchre; and stooping down, he sees the linen clothes lying, yet he did not enter. Simon Peter following him then comes, and entered the sepulchre, and beholds the linen clothes lying, and the napkin, which was about his head, not lying with the linen clothes, but wrapt apart in one place. Then therefore he entered and the other disciple that came first to the sepulchre, and saw and believed. NOT EVEN YET HOWEVER did they know the scripture, that he must rise again from the dead. The disciples therefore went away again to THEMSELVES.

*The Douay or Roman.*

the sepulchre. She ran therefore and cometh to Simon Peter, and to the other disciple whom Jesus loved, and saith to them; They have taken away the Lord out of the sepulchre, and we know not where they have laid him. Peter therefore went out and that other disciple, and they came to the sepulchre, and they both ran together, and that other disciple did outrun Peter, and came first to the sepulchre. And when he had stooped down, he saw the linen cloths lying; but he went not in. Then cometh Simon Peter, following him, and went into the sepulchre, and saw the linen cloths lying. And the napkin that had been about his head, not lying with the linen cloths, but apart wrapt up in one place. Then that other disciple also went in, who came first to the sepulchre; and he saw and believed. For as yet, they knew not the scripture, that he must rise again from the dead. The disciples therefore departed again to THEIR HOME.

*The legalized Translation.*

runneth, and cometh to Simon Peter, and to the other disciple, whom Jesus loved, and saith unto them, They have taken away the Lord out of the sepulchre; and we know not where they have laid him. Peter therefore went forth, and that other disciple, and came to the sepulchre. So they ran both together: and the other disciple did outrun Peter, and came first to the sepulchre. And he stooping down, [and looking in,] saw the linen clothes lying; yet went he not in. Then cometh Simon Peter following him, and went into the sepulchre, and seeth the linen clothes lie, and the napkin that was about his head, not lying with the linen clothes, but wrapped together in a place by itself. Then went in also that other disciple, which came first to the sepulchre, and he saw and believed. For as yet they knew not the scripture, that he must rise again from the dead. Then the disciples went away again unto THEIR OWN HOME.



It will be observed from this translation of mine, that the style of John here presents fewer *kai* conjunctions than the introduction to his Gospel. The arrangement, however, of the words of the translation is not better than that of the Greek. It is, indeed, almost word for word. It displays more literary taste than the Douay or the legalized version. Hence it will appear that John's conjunctions, in the beginning of his Gospel, are designed. The translations of the two sects resemble each other. But in this translation, there is something more than literary taste; for in more sentences than one even the sense, it will be remarked, is not given either by the Douay or legalized version. This is really abominable, coming as these translations profess to do from reputed authorities and learned men. The extract is taken from the quarto edition published at Dublin in 1816, with copious sectarian Roman notes—compared too, as is asserted on the title-page, with the Hebrew, Greek, and other languages, under the approbation of the Most Reverend Doctor Troy.

The first Greek expression, where the sense is not given, is, *ΩΝ ΜΑΘΗΤΗΣ*, which should be as rendered, *THOUGH A DISCIPLE*. Of this expression, notice is taken in the Introductory Dissertation on John. Similar good Greek expressions exist in the other Evangelists, untranslated: see for example Luke, *Ταυτην δε, θυγατερα Αβρααμ ουσαν, ην εδησεν ο Σατανας ιδου δεκα και οκτω ετη, ουκ εδει λυθηναι απο του δεσμου τουτου τη ημερα του σαββατου*, that is, *YET this woman, THOUGH A DAUGHTER of Abraham, whom Satan bound, lo, eighteen years, ought not to be loosed from this bond on the Sabbath day*. The translation of the Douay is, *BECAUSE HE WAS A DISCIPLE*. Do you, Doctor Troy, call this a comparison with the Greek? The legalized translation of the passage is, *BEING A DISCIPLE*. The true sense, however, of John's Greek conveys the idea of courage on the part of Joseph—that, *though a disciple*, he went to Pilate and asked the body of Jesus.

Hence Mark also notices this characteristic quality of Joseph in the following expression: *τολμησας*, *being bold*, he went to Pilate and *ητησατο* asked *himself* the body. Passing over the perfect passive participle *κεκρυμμενος*, rendered by both versions *adverbially*—for which there is no reason—and to the ignorant, the solecisms of the Greek verbs of the passage, you may consider the next important Greek expression, *προς εαυτους*, *TO THEMSELVES*, which the legalized version renders *TO THEIR OWN HOME*, and the Douay *TO THEIR HOME*. *Εαυτους* is a straightforward Greek pronoun, which any novice might have rendered properly. This very pronoun, moreover, is often used by the other Evangelists in the very same sense, a sense which merely implies that the disciples went away again to their own, selfish, earthly nature.

The third and last very important Greek expression is, *τη δε ΜΙΑ των σαββατων*, which I have rendered strictly according to the Greek—*on the ONE however of the sabbaths!* This is an extraordinary but a very obvious translation: I must not, however, depart from the Greek. Luke, to whom this expression is common and familiar, employs it on the very same occasion as John—*on the very resurrection*. Here, consequently, we have an excellent path. *The first order of proofs in favour of the translation*, is the undeviating consistency of all the examples of *ΜΙΑ*. Wherever indeed he uses the *εις, μια, εν*, which he does repeatedly in his Gospel, he sacredly preserves the numerical order of the word—*ONE*! Hence, for example, his *εγενετο εν τω ειναι αυτον εν ΜΙΑ των πολων*, *in ONE of the cities*.<sup>a</sup> *Εγενετο εν ΜΙΑ των ημερων*, *it happened on ONE of the days*.<sup>b</sup> *Εγενετο εν ΜΙΑ των ημερων*, *it happened on ONE of the days*.<sup>c</sup> *Εν δε διδασκων εν ΜΙΑ των συναγωγων εν τοις σαββασι*, *he was however teaching in ONE of the synagogues on the sabbaths*.<sup>d</sup> *Ποιησον με ως*

<sup>a</sup> Luke, v. 12.<sup>b</sup> v. 17.<sup>c</sup> viii. 22.<sup>d</sup> xiii. 10.

ΕΝΑ των μισθίων σου, *make me as ONE of thy hired servants.*<sup>a</sup> Προσκαλεσάμενος ΕΝΑ των παιδων, *having called ONE of the.*<sup>b</sup> Προσκαλεσάμενος ΕΝΑ εκαστον των χρεωφειλετων, *having called each ONE of the debtors.*<sup>c</sup> Επιθυμησετε ΜΙΑΝ των ημερων του υιου του ανθρωπου ιδειν, *you shall eagerly desire to see ONE of the days of the son of man.*<sup>d</sup> There are other examples equally explicit; but it is needless to pursue the subject farther. Our last example, which is in perfect harmony with its companions, τη δε ΜΙΑ των σαββατων, *on the ONE however of the sabbaths,*<sup>e</sup> is equally explicit. Nothing, in short, can be more consistent or literary. In none of the *μια*'s, however, does he use the Greek article except towards the *one* at the end—the *one* about which we are conversing.

*The second order of proofs in favour of the subject, is, wherever the sense requires the other corresponding numeral πρωτος, FIRST, it is invariably employed by Luke; and that too on four very definite series of enumeration. The first series forms the great supper, when many were bidden; and the ο πρωτος, the FIRST, and not the ο εις, the ONE, ειπεν αυτω, said to him.*<sup>f</sup> The second series is the unjust steward and his debtors, whom when he had called, he ελεγε τω πρωτω, *said to the FIRST.*<sup>g</sup> The third series is the nobleman and his servants, where Luke remarks, παρεγενετο δε ο πρωτος, *the FIRST then came; και ηλθεν ο δευτερος, and the SECOND also came.* The fourth series, is the statement of the Sadducee on the resurrection, επτα αδελφοι ησαν, there were seven brethren; και ο πρωτος λαβων γυναικα, *the FIRST having taken a wife;*<sup>h</sup> ο δευτερος την γυναικα, *the SECOND.*

*The third order of proofs which ought to be advanced on the subject, is the juxta-position and proper discrimination of μιας, ONE, from πρωτος, FIRST, in the same paragraph.*

<sup>a</sup> Luke, xv. 19.<sup>b</sup> xv. 26.<sup>c</sup> xvi. 5.<sup>d</sup> xvii. 22.<sup>e</sup> Luke, xxiv. 1.<sup>f</sup> xiv. 18.<sup>g</sup> xix. 16.<sup>h</sup> xx. 29.

Speaking of those who were bidden to the great supper, Luke says, *ἤρξαντο ἀπο μίας παραιτεῖσθαι πάντες*, *they all at ONCE began to excuse themselves* [or beg to excuse themselves, or beg to be excused]: Luke proceeding in the enumeration of the different characters, uses not *εἷς*, *the ONE*, but *ὁ πρῶτος εἶπεν αὐτῷ*, *the FIRST said to him*.

From these and other proofs, which might be brought to corroborate the fact, it is evident and satisfactory, that the *τῇ ΜΙΑ τῶν σαββατῶν*, *on the ONE of the sabbaths*, is the only uniform translation. Our Evangelist John knows as well as Luke the difference between the numeral orders, *πρῶτος* and *εἷς*. Hence the first then on entering the waters after the troubling, *ὁ οὖν πρῶτος ἐμβας μετὰ τὴν ταραχὴν*, *the FIRST*, and not the *ONE*.<sup>a</sup>

We have now to observe, that the Syrians and Hebrews reckoned their weeks by sabbaths—*four sabbaths* being equivalent to *four* weeks. If we also admit that they called the day after the old sabbath, *the ONE* of, or in the *sabbath* or *week*—the next day, *the TWO* of the *sabbath* or *week*, the Messiah is consequently represented as rising on our Christian sabbath before day-light, fulfilling the *technical time σημερον, και αυριον και τη ε[ρ]χομενη*. The Septuagint does not assist us here. *אחת*, the Hebrew, *one*, is sometimes used for the cardinal and the ordinal. The Syriac *ܐܠܝܟܝܢ*, is in the same state. *Σαββατῶν* is plural—*sabbaths*. 'The Passover is kept for *seven* days. Has this any influence on the Greek expression?

*The Geographical and Topographical Allusions to the Journeys of Christ—the Scene of the Drama.*


'The geographical and topographical allusions to the journeys of Christ is an interesting subject, to which I have merely alluded in the summing up on the style of John. In the third verse of the fourth chapter, for example, he

---

<sup>a</sup> John, v. 4.

leaves Judæa and returns to Galilee. Samaria lies between the two provinces; it was consequently necessary for him to pass through Samaria on his route to the latter, of which John takes notice. In the fifth chapter we find him again at Jerusalem. In the sixth, we see him once more in Galilee, which is nearly a hundred miles distant from the former.

### Σολοικισμοί, *Solecisms of John.*

John has been censured for solecisms, which in my introductory dissertation on this Apostle, I have summed up under the term *anachronisms*, because speaking ignorantly of the apparent miscalculations of the *times* or *tenses* of the Greek verbs. The  Messiah or Anointed of God, however, in contradistinction to the anointed of men, occupies not merely a past, but a present existence throughout all time. Hence the groundless censures of the ignorant. Behold his present Greek participles, ο τρωγων μου την σαρκα και πινω του αιματος !

### *For Conclusion on the Translation.*

Before leaving the translation, it may be as well to remark, that there are sometimes reasons for and against some translations, of which common readers can have no idea. For the word Γνωρίζω, rendered by me *swear*, I might in a second edition give *declare*. This, however, does not belong to the essentials. But it is not my intention to follow out the subject farther, though there are many words belonging to the essentials unnoticed; such as INA, *everywhere*, in the expression των πτωχων INA μνημονευωμεν, *the poor EVERYWHERE we should remember*. Δυναμις, of the third of Galatians, translated *miracles*, has no reference to *miracles* strictly so called, but to the influence or working of the spirit of the individual over his brain, which to the multitude is a miracle.

Several topics of importance have been passed over too

briefly, even where evidence for strengthening my positions could have been exhibited, as the **FOUR** for the **FOURTEEN** years; seeing the oldest and most valuable of ecclesiastical records, the *Chronicon Alexandrinum*, translates chronologically with me, reckoning only **ETH Δ' FOUR YEARS**, ἀφ' ου εβαπτισθη και ανεβλεψεν, *from Paul's baptism* till the time of his going up to Jerusalem, which is the more gratifying, as I was not aware of its contents till I came by **LITERATURE** to the same conclusion. On ecclesiastical history, Semler, from whom I have been obliged to differ in some things, writes with a great deal of liberality. Peace be to his ashes!

The philosophy and truth of the *mountain* will be also strengthened by investigation of *profane history*, but in reality *sacred history* not understood. Hence the mountain, **ΙΔΑ, Ida**, is *God*, or the *Mountain God*: **ΟΔΥΜ—ΠΟΣ, Heaven**, having the same letters as the Syriac ܐܕܡ, Hebrew ֶאֱדָם, Chaldaic ܐܕܡ, Arabic علم, Ethiopic 𐩈𐩢𐩨, Roman *olim*. Mere Greek scholars lead us astray. Many of the Greek writers, however, themselves were not great scholars, otherwise we should have heard more of this subject.

---

It is about five years since I circulated, in London, the scriptural representation of the Messiah as existing in, and preached not to, but in every creature under Heaven. Since that time several individuals have come forward on my views. Some, also, have been encroaching on my midnight labours without acknowledgment.

Words placed within brackets do not exist in the original.

☞ I beg to thank here several Librarians for their kindnesses.

*London, January, 1841.*

THE

## HOLY EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE GALATIANS.

---

1 CHAP. I. PAUL, an apostle, not from men, nor through  
man, but through Jesus Christ and God, [the] Father  
2 who raised him<sup>a</sup> from the dead; and all the brethren  
3 with me to the churches of Galatia, grace to you and  
peace from God, [the] Father and [from] Lord of us  
4 Jesus Christ, who gave himself for our sins,<sup>b</sup> that he

---

<sup>a</sup> Του ὑψωσαντος αὐτον ἐκ νεκρῶν, *who raised him from [the] dead*: νεκρῶν is plural. *Dead* was a common phrase among the inspired men. Hence the *dead* shall hear the voice of the Son of God—they that hear shall live. This is the resurrection of the Christ. Hence too the expression of the Septuagint from Isaiah, οἱ νεκροὶ ζῶντες οὐ μὴ ἴδωσιν—the dead may, should or shall, not see life; or as it is expressed differently, οὐ μὴ ἀναστῶσιν οἱ νεκροί, the *dead* shall or will not rise—(Isaiah, xxvi. 14). *Why seek ye the living among the dead?* Τὶ ζητεῖτε τοῦ ζῶντος μετὰ τῶν νεκρῶν, is written by Luke figuratively over the resurrection of the Christ. This is the true resurrection of the *dead* in crimes and vices and atheism.

<sup>b</sup> Του δόντος αὐτον περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν, *gave himself for our sins*. In the Syriac it is, gave his *life* instead of *himself*. The word is ܡܝܬܐ, or in Hebrew מַיְתָה. A beautiful old Syriac manuscript, now in the British Museum, which I have examined, has this reading or translation. Hence the prophet gave his *soul* or life. It does not matter whether it is ܡܝܬܐ or ܡܝܬܐ. I mention this because some ignorant Unitarian followers of the Christ have made of this molehill, or rather plain, a mountain. The true idea of the

might deliver us from the TENDENCY of a MALIGNANT SPIRIT,<sup>a</sup> according to the will of God, and Father of us, to whom belongs the glory throughout existences of existences. [It is] TRUTH.<sup>b</sup>

6 I am surprised that you remove *yourselves* so soon  
7 from him that called you into the grace of Christ<sup>c</sup> to  
another gospel WHICH DOES NOT EXIST: but if [you  
have] not, there are some troubling you and wishing to  
8 pervert the gospel of the Christ. But even though we  
or an angel from heaven preach to you a gospel different  
from that which we preached *ourselves* to you, let him  
9 be cursed. As we have already said and do now say

Christ is that he has power to lay down his life of himself and take it up again—the very idea that is ascribed to Marcion, whose works lying Christians have destroyed.

<sup>a</sup> Εκ του ισχυατου αιματος πονηρου, from the tendency of a malignant or destructive spirit, or from the set in malignant spirit or existence. Ενιστατες, the participle præterite of *ει* and *ιστημι* for *ισστηκως*. The adjective *πονηρου*, is very frequently rendered by the different translators of the Septuagint from *ῥ* or *ῥ*, implying violence, or an inclination to annoy or destroy. I have examined about three hundred passages of this word in connection with the Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriac, and the Septuagint. It is a spirit coupled with a material destructive tangible apparatus, as part of the leading character and form of the man, if such an individual can be so called. See Ephesians, ii. 2, *κατα τον ΑΙΩΝΑ του κοσμου τωτου*, according to the spirit of this world. The actions of men generally are destructive—born so—educated worse.

<sup>b</sup> Αμην, the Hebrew word *אמן*, in Greek characters, ΤΡΥΤΗ. Hence the origin of our word AMEN repeated at the end of our prayers. The radical meaning of the Hebrew word is *to nourish*, or *feed*. Hence the beautiful philosophy of this term.

<sup>c</sup> Εἰς ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον, ο οὐκ ἔστιν· ἀλλ' ἢ μὴ—to another gospel which does not exist; but if [you have] not.... There are some difficulties attending the common reading inexplicable. Manuscripts vary a little. The Syriac version has a different reading, which is an attempt to improve the common. Semler, and other scholars, have expressed their doubts. The Claromontanus has *nisi si sunt aliqui*. Cyprianus has also *nisi si*. Ambrosiaster presents some difference. The context confirms my reading. A comma should be introduced after *μὴ*. Perhaps from *Christ* to *ἀλλ'* might, as Semler thinks, be drawn out.



again, if any preach to you a gospel different from that  
 10 which you received, let him be cursed! Do I now  
 indeed conciliate men or God? or do I seek to please  
 men? For if I had hitherto pleased men, I had not  
 11 myself been a servant of Christ. I swear<sup>a</sup> indeed to  
 you, brethren, that the gospel which was preached a  
 12 gospel by me is not according to man; for I neither  
 received it from man nor was taught but through a re-  
 13 velation of Jesus Christ. For you have heard of my  
 former conduct in Judaism, because I persecuted ex-  
 ceedingly the church of God, and made it a desola-  
 14 tion; and excelled in Judaism many of my equals, being  
 extraordinarily zealous for the traditions of my fathers.  
 15 When God however who separated me from the womb  
 16 of my mother and called me through his grace, did  
 please to<sup>b</sup> reveal his son in me, I OUGHT TO PREACH  
 HIM the gospel among the Gentiles; <sup>c</sup>CONSEQUENTLY  
 I DID NOT CONSIDER MYSELF<sup>d</sup> RESPONSIBLE to flesh  
 17 and blood; nor did I go up to Jerusalem to those  
 who were apostles before me, but I went into Arabia  
 21 and returned again to Damascus.<sup>e</sup> Afterwards I went

<sup>a</sup> Γνωρίζω, *I swear*, is sometimes used in the Septuagint to express the up-  
 lifting of the hand in an oath.

<sup>b</sup> Αποκαλύψαι, the first aorist, to *reveal* or rather *uncover*. *Ἰνα ὑπαγγιλι-  
 ζομαι*, *I ought or it was my duty*, is the true and elegant translation of this  
 subjunctive here coupled with *ἵνα*; but I have not, in every similar case, so  
 rendered this Greek idiom in our language.

<sup>c</sup> Εὐθὺς, *consequently*.

<sup>d</sup> Προσενθίμην is the middle, from *πρὸς, ἀνα, τίθημι*—Literally, *to place or  
 put myself up to* for their approbation or condemnation—did not *consider my-  
 self responsible*—which is an extraordinary translation. The context con-  
 firms it.

<sup>e</sup> Επειτα μίτα . . . it does not appear to me that these verses are Paul's.  
 Apart from *ισταρῆσαι*, which is an awkward word here, there are other ob-  
 jections. Behold ye Grecians the style, *επειτα μίτα ἰστητέα*. Besides ye  
 men of the light from Heaven, is it likely that Paul after going up purposely  
 to see Peter at Jerusalem, should talk in the next chapter, of Peter only  
*appearing to be a pillar*. He that hath ears to hear, let him hear! Ω μαι

22 into the regions of Syria and Cilicia. I was myself,  
 however, personally unknown to the churches of Judea  
 23 which are in Christ. Only indeed they had heard, that  
 he who formerly persecuted us, now<sup>a</sup> preaches the  
 gospel of the TRUTH, which he formerly destroyed; and  
 they glorified God in me.

1 CHAP. II. Afterwards,<sup>b</sup> in the course HOWEVER OF PRO-

1370ν! ΕΠΕΙΤΑ ΔΙΑ might have done, if inconsistency had not appeared.—  
 Translation, “*Afterwards, after three years I went up to Jerusalem to see  
 Peter, and remained with him fifteen days; but other of the apostles I did  
 not see, except James the brother of the Lord. The things, however, which  
 I write to you, behold, before God, that I lie not.*”

<sup>a</sup> Ευαγγελίζεται την πίστιν *preaches the gospel of the TRUTH.* Πίστις is  
 only another word for ἀληθία. *Justice, benevolence, and truth* are the weighty  
 matters of the law. Our dark vulgar version says, *judgment, mercy, and  
 faith.*

<sup>b</sup> ΕΠΕΙΤΑ ΔΙΑ ΔΙ ΚΑ ΤΙΣΣΑΡΩΝ ΙΤΩΙ, AFTERWARDS, IN THE COURSE  
 HOWEVER OF PROBABLY FOUR YEARS.

What an exhibition of the wisdom and learning and doubts of sixteen cen-  
 turies is embodied in this translation!!! It has given me much consideration;  
 but the result has been, thank God, the true reading. Other scholars have  
 been also much perplexed about *so great a number of years*, which they have  
 conjectured to be the very number now given by me in the text, without the  
 alteration of a single letter. Chrysostom has δι after ιτωιτα, which I am in-  
 clined to think is not the true reading. Δια δι is common to Paul. Hence its  
 recurrence in the fourth verse of this chapter, δια δι τους παριστανους. Κα,  
 which follows δια δι, is an enclitic of the Doric dialect, qualifying τιςσαρων,  
 implying an idea of *not decided certainty—perhaps—about—probably—near-  
 ly—something near the mark.* It is unnecessary here to enter into κα. The  
 Doric writers supply examples of various positions and meanings.

Νημιθα καμμις ις ορθον ιαυ κα γρατος αιιδες

Εξ ινας κιλαδση αιαρχων ιντριχα δυρη.—THEOCR.

Scholz, in his Greek Testament, refers his readers to Item Chronic Alex. ut  
 videtur, where τιςσαρων is alluded to. The old Greek manuscripts having  
 no division of letters and words, have caused the passage to be mistrans-  
 lated. They read thus:—Επιταδιαδικατισσαρωνιτωιταλιναιβην. But  
 even this is easy compared with the realities of manuscripts. Persecutions,  
 the dark ages, and knavery, caused undoubtedly the reading of the Greek  
 scriptures to be very early lost. His going to Jerusalem appears to refer to  
 Acts ix. 26.



3 should run or have run into PUBLIC ; BUT<sup>a</sup> WHERE HOW-  
EVER Titus who was with me, THOUGH a GREEK was

μηδὲ μεταίτη τρία, διπατισσάων περιλθόντων ἑτων, τότε ἀνατίθης μήπως εἰς κείνους  
τρέχης ; καὶ ποῶν βέλτιον ἢ ἐνθὺς ἀρχαίμην τοῦτο ποιῆσαι, ἢ μεταίτη τὰς αὐτάς ;  
τί δὲ καὶ τρέχης, εἰ μὴ πισυσμίνος ἡς, ὅτι οὐκ εἰς κείνους τρέχης. Τίς οὕτως ἀνοήτος,  
ὡς ἰτὴ τὰς αὐτάς κηρύττειν, οὐκ ἰδὼς ὅτι κηρύττειν καλῶς ; καὶ τὸ πολὺ τοῦτου πάλιν  
ἐπορωτίτερον, ὅτι κατὰ ἀποκαλύψιν φησὶν ἀνιλεῖσθαι. I address Paul and ask the  
same questions as Chrysostom. I have, however, O Chrysostom, answered  
them !

<sup>a</sup> ΑΛΛ' ΟΤ ΔΕ ΤΙΤΟΣ Ο ΣΥΝ ΕΜΟΙ, ΕΛΛΗΝ ὢν, ΠΑΡΑΓΕΣΘΗ ΠΟΡΙΤΗΜΕΝΗ, but where  
however Titus who was with me, though a Greek, was compelled to be cir-  
cumcised. I published this correction in thirty-seven. Οὐ ΔΙ, *where how-  
ever*, is a masterly and not uncommon expression of Paul. Hence, Romans  
fifth chapter, ΟΤ ΔΕ ΟΥΚ ἸΣΤΙ ΝΟΜΟΣ, οὐδὲ ΠΑΡΑΒΑΣΙΣ, where however there is not  
a law, neither is there a transgression. In the sixth chapter we have, Οὐ ΔΙ  
ἸΠΛΙΟΝΑΣΙΝ ἢ ἈΜΑΡΤΙΑ, *where however* sin abounded. It is proper to tell the  
unlearned, that in the ancient Greek manuscripts there are no accents, a cir-  
cumstance which may cause the passage, viewed in itself by inferior Greek  
scholars, to be read two ways. I repeat the expression *inferior* Greek  
scholars. It is astonishing that such a translation should have been allowed  
to stand one day. Οὐ, *where*, is a very different word from οὐ, *not*, or οἶδι.  
In the Alexandrine manuscript there are no accents to be seen in this passage :  
hence the capability of being misunderstood by mere word men ; besides, the  
words are not separated in this manuscript, they run on in a perpetual un-  
interrupted stream, so that οὐ δι may be read conjunctly or separately. I  
have merely taken the latter course, which removes all the difficulties.  
Erasmus, confounded by the previous number of Greek scholars, who read  
the passage as our vulgar version and European and Eastern translations do,  
nevertheless thought the passage imperfect—that Paul's Greek was wrong.  
But how would this great man rejoice at seeing the obstacle so easily re-  
moved. Beza, however, who was not such a man or scholar as Erasmus,  
appears to be a little surprised at this proposition of Erasmus, and endeavours  
to explain the nonsense of the common reading. Of δια δι, he talks thus : δι  
pro δι vel διητα positum est : cujus enallages exemplo vide in Budæi com-  
mentariis. Non erat igitur causa cur Erasmus hoc expungeret, ex Hieronymi  
opinione, qui putavit redundare, quod non præcedat μιν ; sed imperite, ut  
alibi diximus. How foolish, Beza, would you look after this translation ! All  
scholars of any note stop here—Origen, Chrysostom, Theodoretus, Tertullian,  
Ambrose, Hieronymus, Augustinus, Melancthon, have long dissertations. It  
would be useless after these to mention any very modern attempts to retain  
and solve the difficulty of the common reading. However, to please the  
senseless unlearned crowd, who are governed by names, I notice the trifling

4 compelled to be circumcised, in consequence however of  
sneaking false brethren, who crept in to observe the  
freedom which we have in Christ Jesus,<sup>a</sup> that they might  
5 enslave us; to<sup>b</sup> whom, WHERE HOWEVER we yielded tem-

production of Professor Scholefield, Regius Professor of Greek at Cambridge, who, however, frankly says, that he does not profess to understand the common English version here; he proposes the substitution of *only* after *but*. This, however, is not creditable to a professor of Greek at Cambridge. There is a very erroneous, unscriptural, unlearned translation of the same professor in Hebrews, which must be condemned. It is in connection with *ἐπὶ νεκροῖς*, which he renders *over* dead [sacrifices]. Let the professor understand that the vulgar reading is here the right one. My translation, for his consideration, is, "For where a testament *exists*, the death of the testator necessarily follows; for a testament is valid after men are dead, because (or since) it is of no authority whatever while the testator is alive." *Μη ποτε ισχυρι, is never available or is never of any force*. There are some things worthy of being followed, but he must give up his *mediatory sacrifice*, and shew more sense and learning.

*Ἕλλην ὢν, though a Greek*—my translation is as plain, straightforward sailing in Greek as can be, yet how miserably has this simple elegant Greek expression been twisted, by the fathers and scholars, to make sense with the absurd *οὐδε*! It is not at all wonderful.

*Ὡς ἀνὴρ, ὅστις τροποῖσι συντάκη, θυραῖος ὢν*

*Μυρίων κρουσάν ὁμαίων ἀνδρὶ κικτηθῆναι φίλος.*—ORESTES.

Hence a man who is congenial in habits [or manners], *though a stranger*, is a better friend for a man to have than ten thousand relations.

Hence also this of Tantalus, *ἀνθρώπος ὢν, though a man*. Another example from the Theog. :

*Πλούτι, θίων καλλίστι καὶ ἡμερίστατι πάντων*

*Σὺν σοὶ, καὶ κακὸς ὢν, γίγνομαι εὖθλος ἀνὴρ.*

O! Plutus, most excellent and amiable of all gods, I, even *though bad*, become with thee a good man.

Paul has two or three examples of the same mode of expression in Galatians. See *κυρίως πάντων ὢν*.

<sup>a</sup> *ἵνα ἡμᾶς*. In one or two codices, F. G. of Griesbach, there is *μη* between *ἵνα* and *ἡμᾶς*. In this case it would read, *lest* they should enslave us; a very good reading. The reader may take either.

<sup>b</sup> *Ὅς, ὅτ ΔΕ πρὸς ὡραν ὑξάμην τῇ υποταγῇ*, to WHOM, WHERE HOWEVER we yielded temporary submission. This is another extraordinary appendage of the preceding *οὐ δε*, which cannot, would not be explained or understood without reference to the former. It has confounded commentators and scholars in every age. All learned men have written large commentations on

porary submission, that the truth of the gospel might continue with you. From<sup>a</sup> those however who appeared to be of some consequence, whatever they formerly were, I differ nothing—God accepts not the *face* of a man—for they of consequence did not CONSIDER<sup>b</sup> THEMSELVES RESPONSIBLE to me; but on the contrary, seeing that I truthed the gospel of the uncircumcision as much as Peter did that of the circumcision—for he who influenced<sup>c</sup> Peter to an apostleship of the circumcision, also influenced me to the Gentiles—and knowing the grace given me, James and<sup>d</sup> Peter and John, who ap-

this passage. Semler, of Halle, a man of considerable historical reading and learning, whom Marsh Bishop of Peterborough considered the first man of historical reading in modern times, has no less than twenty-five pages of Latin dissertation on these two, or rather three words. Indeed this man, very unscholar and unhistorical like, proposes to throw out these words altogether, on the suggestion of the reading of the scandalous work of Irenæus, *ad horam cessimus*, and a codex or two of no consideration, whose corrupters or writers tried unsuccessfully to solve the inexplicable difficulties of the monstrous reading of *οὐδὲ*. This Semler, absolutely from a codex and some other circumstances of no moment, draws the following preposterous, yet important conclusion: *ex his igitur, quæ hio collegimus, apparebit lectionem sine negatione antiquioribus confirmari testimoniis Irenæi et Tertulliani!!* Learned man, Semler, how foolish would you look if you were to rise from the dead and see this translation! However, this proves one great circumstance, that there is *no negation* in the passage, which is arrived at, however, not by throwing out any thing—that the sense appeared to you and others as incapable of a negation. Tertullian censures Marcion for the common reading; but here Tertullian is too much of a rhapsodist for us, at least the work against Marcion that goes under his name.

<sup>a</sup> ὅτι διὰ τῶν δακρυῶντα ἡμεῖς τῇ, οὕτως ποτε ἦσαν, οὐδὲν μὲν διαφίε. Here I consider *διαφίε* as used impersonally, in so far at least as a translation into our language is concerned, but connected with the preposition *απο*. It is well known that *διαφίε* is often joined to a genitive without a preposition.

<sup>b</sup> Προσενδύεσθαι is the same word as that of the sixteenth verse, *προσενδύμεν* of the first chapter. The general translations of this verse, European or Latin, are very bad, even nonsensical: there are difficulties.

<sup>c</sup> *Ενέργησας*, it is difficult to get a very good word for this. *Energy* is the Greek.

<sup>d</sup> Ἰακώβος καὶ Πέτρος καὶ Ἰωάννης. In the general Greek manuscripts and

peared to be pillars, gave to me and Bar-nabas the right hand of fellowship, THOUGH we obviously [belonged] 10 to the Gentiles, and they to the circumcision: nevertheless,<sup>a</sup> the poor EVERY WHERE we should remember—the very thing which I had been eager in practising.

printed Greek Testaments, Cephas, instead of Peter, is the reading; but they both mean the same person. It ought to be Peter throughout. In the eleventh and fourteenth verses, the Doway English translation, which is the church of Rome version, has Cephas instead of Peter. The Syriac manuscripts and versions explain this confusion admirably, where Cephas is used in the Evangelists for Peter. I have preferred the translation of *να* *though* to *that*. It will be observed, that both *go* and my *belong* are not in the text. Paul had always been going to and among the Gentiles, and therefore did not require to be sent; did not receive his authority or mission from men. The whole context and sense are against any such interpretation.

<sup>a</sup> *Μοινοι των πτωχων να μνημονουωμιν*, nevertheless, or only the poor EVERY WHERE we should remember. This is another extraordinary translation which I present to the learned and the unlearned world. Not a trace of this have I found any where among the learned disquisitions of past ages; nevertheless, I insist upon it. Among the older Greek writers in particular, with whom Paul appears to have been as well acquainted as a native and a learned native, *να* is frequently used for *where* and *every where*. In the Greek play of Hecuba alone, there are five examples of the former. See the 2, 11, 99, 703, 957 verses.

Λιπών, να λίδης χωρίς οικισται έινω.

Πατήρ, να, ει ποτ' Ιλιου τειχη πεισι.

Να εκληρωθην και προσισταχρήν.

Να ο γίγνοι πατήρ ειτίτο νιν πρηνέας.

Εν τω δι ποτμω τυγχαίνουσ', να ειμι νυν.

See Plato in Euthy, *ουκ αρα ορθως ιχμυ λιγινι* · *να γαρ διος, ενθα και αιδως, αλλ' να μιν αιδως, ενθα και διος*. See Arrian, *να σιε αυτους αματιλοι ησαν*. See Aristop, *πατρις γαρ ιστι πασ' να αν πραττη τις ου*. See Herod. *α δακιδαιμονιοι, να δοκιμικιτηδηιωτατον ημιας εναι ισταναι*. But it will not do to pursue here this word farther. The Greek word *να* appears to be the same as the Hebrew נָחַ and derives its meaning and spelling from the same root. In the Hebrew and Syriac we see the philosophy of the word, and the application of its *ubiquity*, for it signifies *a camp, to pitch a camp, to sit down any where*. Besides the common translations, Latin or European, are not sensible, *only the poor THAT we should remember*.—a very likely thing, indeed, for Paul to express in his own good, flowing, easy Greek, a sectarian sentiment, in bad or exceedingly elliptical Greek. I give the reading as incontrovertible.

11 When Peter however went to Antioch, I opposed him  
 12 in his *presence*, because he had been *acting against his knowledge*; for before the arrival of some individuals from James, he eat with the Gentiles, but when they came, he withdrew and separated himself, fearing those of the  
 13 circumcision; and the other Jews dissembled with him; so  
 14 that even Bar-nabas was carried away with their hypocrisy. But when I saw that they walk not uprightly according to the TRUTH of the gospel, I said to Peter before all, if thou though a Jew livest as a Gentile, and not as a Jew, why dost thou compel the Gentiles to live as the  
 15 Jews? We, by nature Jews, and not the<sup>a</sup> UNJUST  
 16 of the Gentiles—knowing, moreover, that man is not justified by works of a law, if not through the TRUTH of Jesus Christ—even we have trusted in Christ Jesus, since we should be justified by the TRUTH of Christ, and not by works of a law, because ALL FLESH SHALL  
 17 not be justified<sup>b</sup> by works of the law! If, however, seeking to be justified in Christ, even we ourselves were found UNJUST, certainly Christ is the minister of sin!  
 18 Never! For if I build up again the very rites which  
 19 I destroyed, I constitute myself a transgressor. For I, through the law, became dead to the law, seeing I  
 20 should live to God. I am crucified with Christ: live, however, I do, though it is no longer I but Christ alive within me. The life, however, which I now live in the flesh, I do live through the TRUTH [even] this of the Son of God who loved me, and gave himself for  
 21 me. I do not LIMIT the grace of God; for if justice [come] through the law, certainly Christ died uselessly.

---

<sup>a</sup> Ἀμαρτωλοὶ, *unjust*; but *prevaricators* is a common bearing of this scripture expression. Christ came to call the *unjust*, not the *just* to repentance.

<sup>b</sup> Ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὐ δικαιοῦσινται πᾶσα σὰρξ, by the works of the law not all flesh shall be justified. This is another extraordinary translation. The flesh of Christ is just.



- 1 CHAP. III. Oh! foolish Galatians, who has bewitched you, in whose eyes Jesus Christ has been publicly exhibited crucified among you?<sup>a</sup>
- 2 This only do I wish to learn of you, did you receive<sup>b</sup> the spirit from the works of the law, or from the
- 3 understanding of the TRUTH? Are you so foolish? After having begun in spirit, do you now perfect yourselves by the flesh? Have you EXPERIENCED such
- 4 effects to no purpose, if, indeed, to no purpose? Does he then who is directing<sup>c</sup> in you the spirit, and working miracles within you, [do it] from the works of the law
- 5 or from the understanding of the TRUTH? Hence Abraham trusted in God, and [this] was reasoned to
- 6 him for justice. Know assuredly that they of the
- 7 TRUTH, [even] these are sons of Abraham. The scripture foreseeing, indeed, that God justifies the nations by the TRUTH, did itself formerly preach the gospel to

<sup>a</sup> Τη αλυσίᾳ μὴ πεισθῆσαι, I leave out, in harmony with some of the best readings. On the bewitching of the Galatians, the Doway Roman English version of 1816 has this note appended for its readers: "For any one people or person to forsake the faith of their first apostles and conversion, at the voice of a few novelists, seemeth to wise men a very bewitching and senseless brutishness. Such is the case of our poor country, Germany, and others."

<sup>b</sup> Το πνεῦμα λαβίτε, Did you receive the spirit? The doctrine of the spirit. Infinite evils have resulted from the misconstruction of this simple expression, which he that runs may read, were it not that the blind are daily leading the blind. The Spirit of Light and of Truth, which is a part of the Holy Spirit, exists in every one.

<sup>c</sup> Ο οὖν πειραρχῶν ὑμῖν το πνεῦμα; Does he then, who is directing in you the spirit? The term πειραρχῶν implies the power of a master or director of a choir, vested more or less in every man. Man may direct the spirit as he likes within him—cause any chord of his brain that he wills to vibrate; but he has no right to complain when he has got his heart's desire that he is miserable or bad, for these terms are synonymous. Hence if mankind are bad, they have themselves to blame. See this passage of Orestes on the same consequences:—

Me. Ὁ θεὸς τί λίσσῃ; τίνα δίδωκεν νεκρίων;

Or. Ἐὐ γ' ἱππας· οὐ γὰρ ζῶ κακοῖς· φάος δ' ἰρῶ.

Abraham, [declaring] that in thee all nations shall be  
 9 happy. So that they of the truth are happy with the  
 10 true Abraham. For as many as are of the works of  
 the law are under a curse, for it is written, Cursed is  
 every one that does not continue to do the duties in all  
 11 the writings of the book of the law. That none, how-  
 ever, is justified by the law in the sight of God is evi-  
 dent, because [it is declared] the just shall live by  
 12 *truth*. But the law is not of the truth; however, he  
 13 that does the duties shall live by them. Christ re-  
 deemed us from the curse of the law, when he made  
 himself a curse for us; for it is written, Cursed is  
 14 every one that hangs<sup>a</sup> on Sina. EVERY WHERE<sup>b</sup> the  
 happiness of the Abraham should come to the nations  
 through Jesus Christ; EVERY WHERE we should re-  
 ceive the declaration of the spirit through the truth.  
 15 Brethren, I speak<sup>c</sup> as a man, none CURTAILS or adds

<sup>a</sup> Ἐπικαταρατός πᾶς ὁ κρεμασμένος ἐπὶ ξύλου. This is an extraordinary reason, which the common reader cannot understand. How any one can, or should be cursed, for hanging on a tree against or with his will, rather than on any other material is inexplicable; the literal interpretation is nonsense. In the Psalm xcvi. we have, *ἐκπασι ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, ὁ κυριεῖς ἐβασίλευσεν ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου*: that is, say among the nations the Lord or Jehovah reigns, or, literally, reigned from Sion. The *ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου* has been erased from the common copies of the Hebrew, so that *ξύλου* does not now generally exist. It is said to have been erased by the Jews, but much more likely by bad Christians. This *ξύλου* stands figuratively for Sina, or Sion. Christ is called the tree of life. Among the Syrians and Chaldeans, a *tree* represented the *animal nature* of man: hence, whoever hangs for salvation on this nature is cursed. He that hangs on the Jewish rites and ceremonies is cursed. It is symbolical of the earthly Jerusalem.

<sup>b</sup> *ἵνα, every where*. I consider with some scholars the sense complete at *ξύλου*, and adopt the reading of *ἵνα, every where*. The reasoning of Paul is favourable.

<sup>c</sup> Ἀδιλοῖ κατα ἀνθρώπων λίγω . . . down to *ὡς το καταργησαι τὴν σαργιλίαν* will be found to be happy compared with the *wretched Latin* and *European vulgar versions* of this passage. Good scholars, willing to admit the light, will declare this. *Ἀδελφαι*, the root of which is *α, τήθει*, *curtails*: codex cla-

to a covenant, even of a man which had been in a state  
 16 of authority. To Abraham undoubtedly the declarations were spoken, and to his seed. [The scripture] does not say, and to the seeds, as to many, but as to  
 17 one, even the seed of thee which is Christ. This however I do affirm, that the law which arose four hundred and thirty years after does not deprive a covenant which had been in a state of authority under God, of its authority BY THE DESTRUCTION of the declaration.  
 18 For if the inheritance [is] of the law, it is no longer  
 19 from the declaration. What then of the law? It was subjoined on account of crimes, WITHOUT WHICH<sup>a</sup> the seed to whom the declaration had been made should come, having been commanded by KINGS<sup>b</sup> through the instrumentality of an INTERPRETER. The interpreter however does not belong to one [individual]. God however is one.  
 20 Is the law then against the declarations of God? Never!  
 21 For if a law capable of creating life had been given, justice would most assuredly have been by the law.  
 22 But the scripture has summed up all under sin, that

---

romon *irritum faciat*; so also, August, Ambrosiast, Sedulius: Tertul, *spernit*, and many others. It is not very material whether *διαθηκη* is rendered covenant or testament.

<sup>a</sup> *Ἀχρὶς σου*, without which, that is agreeing with *νομος*, law. I am aware of the extraordinary nature of this translation. *Ἀχρὶς* has different significations: —as far as, *ἄχρὶς παρὸς*; to or towards me, *ἄχρὶς ἐμοῦ*; for or during, *ἄχρὶ παύσεως*; up to, *ἄχρὶ τῶν χαλινῶν*; within five days, *ἄχρὶς ἡμερῶν πέντε*; till or exclusive of, *ἄχρὶς τῆς αὐτῆς ὥρας*, exclusive of the present hour, or till, which is the common rendering. The radical meaning of the word is *something without*. Romans, *ἄχρὶς γὰρ νόμου ἀμαρτία ἦν ἐν κόσμῳ*, for without the law sin (or injustice) existed in the world. It is a pure Hebrew word, *אָחֵר*, a tiller of the ground, a husbandman. Hence *ἀγρος*, *ἀγρὰ*, *ager*, *acre*, a definite extent of land, something complete. Hence its meaning as an adverb among Greek writers, entirely; the *σπέρμα* or seed had come before the law.

<sup>b</sup> *Ἀγγέλων*, kings, or just men. We have seen the derivation of this word. The Septuagint very frequently renders *מְלָכִים*, *ἄγγελοι*. *Μισιτου*, an interpreter.

the declaration<sup>a</sup> of the TRUTH of Jesus Christ should  
 23 be given to those who are-of-the-truth. Before, how-  
 ever, the arrival of the TRUTH, we guarded ourselves  
 by law shut up AFTER<sup>b</sup> the coming truth had been  
 24 revealed. Hence the law has become itself our school-  
 master for Christ, since we should be justified by the  
 25 TRUTH. The TRUTH, however, having come, we are  
 26 no longer under a schoolmaster. For you are all sons  
 27 of God, through the TRUTH in Christ Jesus. For as  
 many of you as were baptized after Christ, clothed  
 28 yourselves with Christ. There is not a Jew nor a  
 Greek, there is not a SLAVE nor a freeman, there is not  
 a male AND a female,<sup>c</sup> for you are all one in Christ  
 29 Jesus. If, indeed, you belong to Christ, certainly you  
 are a seed of Abraham, and heirs according to the de-  
 claration.

1 CHAP. IV. I do affirm, however, that the heir, as  
 long as he is a child, though lord of all, differs nothing  
 2 from a<sup>d</sup> slave; but is under tutors and governors  
 3 through<sup>e</sup> the previous arrangement of the Father. Even  
 so we also, when<sup>f</sup> children, were in slavery under the rites  
 4 of the world; but when the fulness of the time came,

<sup>a</sup> Επαγγελία, not a *promise* merely but a *declaration*. Πιστινουςι, who are of the truth; so rendered for the purpose of exhibiting the connexion between the noun *truth* and the verb *truth*, as it is in the Greek πιστις—πιστιν.

<sup>b</sup> Εις την μιλλουσιν πιστιν αποκαλυφθηναι, after the coming truth had been revealed. See Romans on εις after. Calvin, sub fidem quæ revelanda erat. Claromon, in eam fidem, quæ post ea retegebatur.

<sup>c</sup> Ουκ εν αρσεν και θηλυ, there is not a male and a female. It is astonishing that almost all translations, European and Latin that I have seen, separate the male and the female. Not so the Greek, not so Paul, not so God. They are incomplete unless conjoined; what God has joined, let not man put asunder; but every marriage formed by man cannot be called the doings of God.

<sup>d</sup> Διαφειρι, is here coupled with its genitive, δουλου.

<sup>e</sup> Αχρη, through.

<sup>f</sup> Ημιν, is not necessary to be rendered into our language.

God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under  
 5 the law, that he might redeem those under the law,  
 6 that we might receive the Sonship. Because, indeed,  
 you are sons, God sent forth the spirit of his Son into  
 7 our hearts, exclaiming, <sup>a</sup> Father. Hence thou art no  
 longer a slave, but a son; if, indeed, a son, also an heir  
 8 of God through Christ. However you then, indeed, not  
 9 knowing God, did serve those by nature not gods. But  
 now knowing God, rather indeed known under God,  
 why do you return again to the weak and beggarly  
 rites which you wish from heaven<sup>b</sup> again to serve.  
 10 You keep days and months and seasons and years!  
 11 I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed fruitless la-  
 12 bour upon you. Consider yourselves<sup>c</sup> as I, because I  
 [am] even as you. Brethren, I ask you,<sup>d</sup> have you  
 13 done me no injury? You yourselves know, indeed,  
 that in weakness of the flesh I preached the gospel my-  
 14 self first to you, and my very experience that of me  
 in the flesh you did not slight nor despise, but you re-  
 ceived me yourselves as a messenger of God; as a  
 15 Christ Jesus. Who<sup>e</sup> then was your delight? For I  
 do declare to you, that you would, if possible, have  
 16 plucked out and given your very eyes to me. Have I  
 at length, MADE <sup>f</sup> MYSELF your enemy by telling you

<sup>a</sup> Αββα, I have left out, for it is the Syriac for *father*, or for the Greek  
 • πατερ. It is singular that the two words should stand in the text.

<sup>b</sup> Ανωθεν, from heaven, or above.

<sup>c</sup> Γινεσθε ως εγω, consider yourselves as I; that is, put yourselves in my  
 place.

<sup>d</sup> Διερωμαι υμων, I ask you. I consider this sentence as interrogatory.

<sup>e</sup> Τις, who, not what. Paul was their happiness. Μακαριςμος, happiness  
 better than blessedness. Ubi igitur beatitudo vestra? Galvin. He has taken  
 the reading of σου ου, which is not so good as τις ου ην.

<sup>f</sup> Εχθρος υμων γιγνομαι, Have I made myself your enemy? The emphatic  
 tendency of γιγνομαι is here explicit. Hence, also, the same application of the  
 same verb by Euripides in *Orestes*.

17 the truth? They praise<sup>a</sup> you not justly, but they wish  
 18 to exclude us, that you may praise them. It is good,  
 indeed, to praise yourselves always in what is good;  
 19 and not only when I am present with you. Little  
 children<sup>b</sup> of me, for whom I am again in labour till  
 20 Christ be formed in you, I did indeed wish to be  
 present with you now, and to change my language;  
 because I am perplexed about you.

21 Tell me, do you who wish to be under the law not<sup>c</sup>  
 22 understand the law? It is certainly written, that Abra-  
 ham had two sons, one by the slave, the other by the free-  
 23 woman. Evidently indeed, the [son] of the slave was born  
 fleshly, while the [son] of the freewoman through the de-  
 24 claration, which things are allegories! For these are two  
 covenants, one obviously from mount Sina, productive  
 25 of slavery, which is Agar: for this Agar Sina is a  
 mountain in Arabia, and corresponds with the present  
 Jerusalem; for she is in slavery with her children;  
 26 while<sup>d</sup> the Jerusalem above is free, which is the mother  
 27 of us. For it is written, Rejoice thou barren though  
 not pregnant: break forth and shout though not in la-

Τοῦτου τις ἀνὴρ ἐγένετο· ἀσυνετώτερος,

Who of men has *made himself* more senseless than this man?

Αὐτὸς πατρὶν μὴτρί' ἐγένετο κτάνων,

He [has] *made himself* more wicked by killing his mother.

Εγίνωκεν μητροκτονίαν, I *have made myself* a matricide, is another example.  
*Become* is not the idea, it is not the Greek.

<sup>a</sup> Ζηλοῦσιν ὑμᾶς, this and the following verse is attended with some difficulties, of which scholars are sensible. I have some doubt, but I take this reading for the present.

<sup>b</sup> Τεκνία μου, and the following verse, ἡλίσσιν, is one sentence. Ἀχρὶς σὺ μορφωθῇ Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν, might be read *without* whom Christ should be formed in you: that is, *without* Paul. Donec formetur in vobis Christus, which is that of other translators besides Calvin. Every man *should* form Christ within him.

<sup>c</sup> Ἀποῦσι, *understand*.

<sup>d</sup> Δε, *while*; freely, according to our idiom.

bour, for the children of the lonely are more numerous than [those] of her who is in possession of a husband. We however brethren like Isaac, are children of the declaration; but as formerly, the [son] born fleshly<sup>a</sup> persecuted him [born] spiritually, so [is it] even now!! But what says the scripture? Cast out the slave and her son, for the son of the slave shall not have an inheritance with the son of the freewoman. Certainly, brethren, we are not children of the slave, but of the freewoman.

1 CHAP. V. Persevere,<sup>b</sup> therefore, in the freedom with which Christ made us free, and do not entangle *your-*  
 2 *selves* again with a yoke of slavery. Behold, I Paul say to you, that if you circumcise yourselves, Christ  
 3 shall profit you nothing. Testify I do indeed again to every circumcised man, that he is obligated<sup>c</sup> to do the  
 4 whole law. You were cut off from the Christ, whosoever of you justify yourselves by the law; you have  
 5 fallen from grace. For we *ourselves take*<sup>d</sup> from the spirit of the TRUTH,<sup>e</sup> the hope of *justice*. For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision avails any thing, nor uncir-  
 7 cumcision, but TRUTH *influenced* by benevolence. You did run well; who hindered you from being persuaded  
 8 by the TRUTH. The persuasion [however] does not

<sup>a</sup> Κατὰ σαρκά, *fleshly*. Hence, also, κατὰ πνεῦμα, *spiritually*. In every case, this translation has not been pursued. It is, however, given as a good specimen.

<sup>b</sup> Στεννίστι, *persevere*. I consider συγχισθί, middle voice, and also περιτιμνήσθι.

<sup>c</sup> Οφειλότης, *obligated*. This translation is, at the very least, suited to our idiom.

<sup>d</sup> Απειδιχομθα, from απο, *in*, διχομαί, middle voice. It is both passive and middle, if we consult only the letters; I see it to be the latter. The kingdom of heaven is taken by ourselves—by force—by violence.

<sup>e</sup> Αληθῆα, *truth*, only another word for αἰσθίς, which the vulgar versions render here *truth*. Why not render every αἰσθίς *truth*, ye vulgar versions? Because it will not suit your purpose!

9 come from him that calls you. A little leaven leavens  
 10 the whole lump. I have persuaded myself in reference  
 to you in the Lord that you will receive for wisdom  
 nothing else; but he, be who he may, that troubles  
 11 you, shall bear the punishment. They *ought* and will  
 12 cut *themselves*<sup>a</sup> off who are disturbing you. I how-  
 ever, brethren, if I yet preach circumcision, why am I  
 still persecuted? Certainly the offence of the cross had  
 13 ceased. You, certainly brethren, were called to freedom,  
 on'y make not the freedom subservient to the flesh,<sup>b</sup>  
 14 but to one another through benevolence. For the whole  
 law is fulfilled in one *sentence* [even] in this, thou shalt  
 15 love thy neighbour as thyself: but if you fight and  
 bite<sup>c</sup> one another, take care that you be not entirely  
 16 eaten by one another. I do say therefore<sup>d</sup> walk in  
*spirit*, and you shall not *perfect* a desire of the flesh.  
 17 The flesh certainly wars against the *spirit*, and the  
 spirit against the flesh. These indeed are opposed to  
 each other, so that you may not do the very things that  
 18 you would. If however you conduct yourselves in  
 19 spirit, you are not under the law. Evident however  
 are the works of the flesh,<sup>e</sup> which are, adultery, for-

<sup>a</sup> Οφίλονται αποκοψονται οι αιατατοντες υμας, *they ought and will cut themselves off who are disturbing you*. I believe in the translation of οφίλον, here, I stand alone: but αποκοψονται is middle voice. Hieronym. and Ambrosiaster, *subvertunt*. I have removed this verse from its common position from the sense of the context.

<sup>b</sup> Τμυς γαρ εν' ελευθερια ενληθνη, αδελφοι· μοιση μη την ελευθεριαν εις αφαρμην τη σαρκι, αλλα δια της αγαπης δουλειυτε αλληλοις. This is a sentence which is somewhat difficult, but miserably mangled by the vulgar as well as the Latin versions. *Vos enim in libertatem vocati estis, fratres: tantum ne libertatem in occasionem detis carni: sed per caritatem servite vobis invicem*. Latini fere omnes. But *detis* is not in the Greek. It is the result of ignorance.

<sup>c</sup> Δακνυτι και καταβητι, *fight and bite*. Our language admits of this two-fold translation.

<sup>d</sup> Πνευματι περιπατυτι, *walk in spirit*: that is plainly, do what is good *within*, and the outside will be also good or clean.

<sup>e</sup> Μαιχ·ια, πορν·ια, αναβαζ·ια, ασιλ·για, υδωλοατρ·ια, φαρμακ·ια, ζηλω·



20 nication, pollution, obscenity, idolatry, incantations, hatreds, rages, *irritations*, *provocations*, *contentions*,

*δυμοι, ιριθισαι, διχασσασαι, φθονοι, φονοι*, the object of this Greek italic will at once be seen by the literary scholar. It was impossible for Paul to throw these words carelessly together. *Χια, νια, σια, για, τρια, πια*, mutually support each other, and express ideas of which each taken singly and separately is utterly incapable. The same may be affirmed of *λοα, μοι; θισαι, σιαι; φθονοι, φονοι*. These are facts and learning, sense and sentiment, which form first rate eloquence, for which Paul has got very little credit from *homunculi* of different ages, who have caused him to pass frequently before the people with their midnight tapers. Here there are four combinations. The first and fourth are the strongest and most remarkable. No words in our language can express *φθονοι, φονοι*. In *envies, murders*, the sense of the eye and the ear is lost, as no mutual influence or external relationship exists between these English terms. *Irritations, provocations*, for *ζηλοι, δυμοι*, is a better translation, presenting as it does both the internal and external idea of the Greek. Hence too *contentions, dissensions*, for *ιριθισαι διχασσασαι*, rivals the Greek in the external without losing much of the internal meaning. *Λιρις, divisions, sects*, is a common notion of this word. Hence *η ουσα ΑΙΡΕΣΙΣ των Σαδδουκαϊων*, Acts. *Απο της ΑΙΡΕΣΕΩΣ των Φαρισαϊων*, Acts. Hence *irritations, provocations, contentions, dissensions, divisions*, is a happy combination. *Πορνεια, ακαθαρσια, ασιλγια, fornication, pollution, obscenity*. These terms are capable of a little variation, and hence the little differences existing among translators; they all however bear on the same topics. The *και τα ομοια τούτοις* resembles the *esse videatur* of Cicero, and the *ιαια πτι-ροιντα* of Homer. The *φθονοι, φονοι*, is the very Homeric *Ζην κυδισσι μιγῖσσι*, the *προσω οπισσω*. Sentential ideas are very apt to be overlooked by the crowd of mere word-men. It is on this account that the character of Paul in this and many other parts of his composition calls for greater attention. Such beauties of expression contain the essence of unqualified greatness. Hence for illustration this admirable verse of Euripides:

Νυμφην τ' ανυμφον, παρθενον τ' απαρθενον.

There is also the following excellent lines from the same poet:

Λογχοφορον, ευπλον, ευιππον

Αρυκατοχον γυνος.

Πα βω; πα στω; πα κλισω.

It would be exceedingly gratifying to pursue longer this learned and critical topic by the exhibition of other authors, whose excellencies are lying before us in great profusion, but the nature of the work presents circumscribed limits. See Romans. In the Sussex Greek manuscript Testament, which has not yet been collated, the reading in some places agrees with the present

- 21 *dissentions, divisions*, envies, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like, of which I foretell <sup>a</sup> you, as I also foretold that they who practise such things shall  
 22 not inherit a kingdom of God. But the fruit of the spirit is love, joy, peace, forbearance, usefulness, goodness, <sup>b</sup>TRUTH, gentleness, temperance; against such  
 23 there is not a law. They in short who belong to the Christ, crucified <sup>c</sup> [and continue to crucify] the flesh  
 24 with the propensities, and the selfish dispositions. If we are alive in spirit, we may also perform the rites and ceremonies in spirit.  
 26 We should not be fond of false glory, provoking one another, envying one another.
1. CHAP. VI. Brethren, if a man be overtaken in any sin, you who are spiritual SYMPATHIZE with such a one in a spirit of gentleness, *asking* yourself, mayest  
 2 thou not also be tried? Bear one another's burdens,

vulgar version. It is *μοιχία, πορνεία, υδωλολατρεία* pro *υδωλολατρεία, ιερί* pro *ιερί*. I have read the whole of Galatians and Romans, but rather late for the present work. There are some little differences, but this beautiful manuscript, though nearly six hundred years old, is too modern for my purpose. It has of course all the accents; the words are little if at all separated, written in small characters. Before each Epistle there is a *υπόθεσις*. It has the reading of *τη αληθεία μη πειθίσθαι*—of the third of Galatians, but it has not the reading of 1 John v.—has no *Αποκαλύψις*. It is well worthy of the designation *beautiful*. I am obliged to his Royal Highness the Duke of Sussex for the use of his library.

<sup>a</sup> *Προλεγειν*, from *προ* and *λεγω*, to tell or speak before, to predict. Hence Demosthenes to Æschines, *τοτ' ἰδὺ σε προλεγειν* *ἡ δὲ μὴ, ὑπεικύνος* *ἡ*. Lord Brougham gives *disclose* for this word, but it is not so—only a part of the meaning.

*Οἱ πρασσοντες*, present participle, literally and rightly, they in the act of practising or doing.

<sup>b</sup> *Πίστις*, truth, not faith. *Εγκρατεία*, temperance in all animal pursuits.

<sup>c</sup> *Τὴν σὰρκα ἵσταμεναι ἐν τοῖς παθήμασι καὶ ταῖς ἰσχυμαῖς*. It is not difficult to see what the *τοῖς παθήμασι* and the *ἰσχυμαῖς* are. *Ἐσταυρωται*, the first aorist, has frequently both a past and present signification. This is one exhibition of it for the unlearned.

3 and thus thoroughly fulfil the law of the Christ. For  
 4 if any think that he is of some consequence, when no-  
 5 thing, he *makes a fool* of himself. Let each therefore  
 6 examine his own mechanism, and then he shall have re-  
 7 joicing in himself alone, and not in another. For each  
 8 shall bear his own burden. Let him however who is  
 9 under instruction in the Logos, associate with him who  
 10 is instructing in all good things. Deceive not your-  
 11 selves; God is not mocked; for whatsoever a man  
 12 sows, even this shall he reap. Because the sower to  
 13 his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption, while the  
 14 sower to the spirit shall of the spirit reap life everlast-  
 15 ing. We however should not grow indifferent in the  
 16 practice of good, for in proper season we shall reap if  
 we faint not. Certainly then as we have opportunity,  
 let us do good to all, chiefly however to the household  
 of the TRUTH.

11 As many as wish to be *respectable in life*, these  
 12 compel you to be circumcised only that they may not  
 13 follow the cross of the Christ. Neither indeed do they  
 14 themselves who are circumcised keep the law; but they  
 15 wish you to be circumcised that they may rejoice in  
 16 your *fleshly opinion*. To me however be there no re-  
 joicing, except in the cross of the Lord of us Jesus  
 Christ, through whom a world has been crucified to  
 me and I unto the world. For in Christ Jesus neither  
 circumcision is any thing, nor uncircumcision, but a  
 new creature. And as many as <sup>a</sup> perform the rites and  
 ceremonies according to this very canon, peace and be-  
 nevolence [be] upon them, *even* upon the Israel of God.  
 See how large a letter I have written to you with my  
 own hand.

---

<sup>a</sup> Στοιχῶμεν, perform the rites and ceremonies. This is giving the full  
 force to the word. Στοιχῶμεν, the future, is as good as the present.

17 The remainder !<sup>a</sup> Let none trouble me ; for I carry  
 18 in my person the *stigma* of the Lord Jesus. The grace  
 of the Lord of us Jesus Christ [be] with your spirit,  
 brethren ; [it is] TRUTH !

---

<sup>a</sup> Του λειψου, the remainder !

---

THE  
HOLY EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE  
ROMANS.

---

1 CHAP. I. PAUL, a servant<sup>a</sup> of Jesus Christ, a called  
apostle when separated after the glad tidings of God,  
2 who formerly spoke<sup>b</sup> himself through his prophets in  
3 holy scriptures of his son, born fleshly of a seed of  
4 David; of the Son of God ordained<sup>c</sup> with power  
spiritually holy, from the resurrection of the dead, Jesus  
5 Christ,<sup>d</sup> the Lord of us, through whom we received  
grace and apostleship after obedience to truth, in all  
6 nations under his name; among whom you also exist,  
7 called by Jesus Christ; to all that are in Rome be-  
loved by God, called holy; grace to you, and peace  
from God, our Father, and Lord Jesus Christ !  
8 First, by all means I do thank my God through Jesus

---

<sup>a</sup> Δουλος, a *servant*, should be a *slave*, the Eastern mode of speaking. It is also scriptural, because men make themselves slaves of vice.

<sup>b</sup> Προειπηγγελλατο, *formerly spoke himself*; middle voice.

<sup>c</sup> Ορειθιντος, some read προορισθιντος,, *endowed essentially*.

<sup>d</sup> It will be remarked that this translation does not present much of a parenthetical character, which is the tendency of general translations: *Ιησου χριστου* follows its legitimate and scriptural phrase, *αναστασιως νεκρων*, *resurrection of the dead*; Syriac, *from among the dead*. Christ is identified as the resurrection and the life.

Christ for you all, because your *truth* is published in  
 9 the whole world.<sup>a</sup> For God is my witness, whom I  
 serve in my spirit in the gospel of his son, that without  
 ceasing I do make mention of you; always in my  
 10 prayers, requesting if by any means I shall at length by  
 the will of God have a prosperous journey in coming to  
 11 you; for I eagerly desire to see you, that I may *SHARE*  
 with you some<sup>b</sup> spiritual gratification *AFTER YOUR*  
 12 *ESTABLISHMENT*; <sup>c</sup> it is even this, to be comforted by

<sup>a</sup> *Truth published in the whole world*, means that the truth which the Roman Christians credited is published in every nation and in every creature.

<sup>b</sup> *ἵνα τι μίταδω χάρισμα ὑμῖν πνευματικόν*, *that I may share with you some spiritual gratification*, which the context confirms. *Μίταδω*, *may share*, is the straightforward meaning of the Greek term. Hence too the very meaning of this word in the Greek poet:

*Μίταδος φίλοις σοῖσι σης ευπραΰας.*

Share with your friends your prosperity.—EURIP.

*Χάρισμα*, *gratification*, from *χαρίζομαι*, the preterperfect *εχαρίσθην*, by rejecting *κα*. *Χαρις*, *χαρις*, *χάρισμα*; English, *grace*, *gratis*, *gratification*. *Gift* is the vulgar rendering; but this is not very good, nevertheless I admit that *gratification* is, though good, not common—this is nothing.

<sup>c</sup> *Εἰς τὸ στήριχθῆναι ὑμᾶς*, *after your establishment*; or, which is not so good, *after you were established*; or, *after your CONFIRMATION*, but of course not the vulgar notion of confirmation, which is prevalent among the Roman Catholic and Episcopal followers of the vulgar false Christ. In my Lecture on the Scriptures, nearly four years ago, I published this translation of the Greek preposition *εἰς*, signifying *after*. Hence Matthew, *βαπτίζω ὑμᾶς ἐν ὕδατι εἰς μετάνοιαν*, I baptize you with water *after* repentance. Men baptize *after* and not *before* or *unto* repentance, which is nonsense: the vulgar, Erasmus, Calvin, Melancthon, *ad poenitentiam*; Church of Rome, English version, *unto penance*; Protestant version, *unto repentance*, which is the same idea. There is, in short, no material difference between the Romish and the Protestant version. In the Scriptures, there is a considerable number of examples of *εἰς*, *after*, of which the following are some:—*εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν πατέρα*, *after* he was a father, or more literally, *after* the existence of him a father, which is not so suitable to our idiom: *εἰς τὸ λογισθῆναι καὶ αὐτοὺς τὴν δικαιοσύνην*, *after* the imputation of justice even to them. But *καὶ* might be here rendered *also*. The following is from the Septuagint, *ἀποστέλλω εἰς αὐτοὺς τὴν μάχαιραν*, I will send the sword *after* them. Some copies have *ἐπὶ* instead of *εἰς*. Nor is there any doubt about the Hebrew word from which

13 you through the mutual truth of you and me. I do not however wish you, brethren, to be ignorant that I often made arrangements<sup>a</sup> myself to come to you, and I have been hindered hitherto; *nevertheless*<sup>b</sup> I should have some fruit as well among you as among other  
14 Gentiles. To Greeks and barbarians, to the wise and  
15 the foolish, I am a debtor. Hence the anxiety<sup>c</sup> in me to preach the gospel myself even to you who are  
16 at Rome: for I am not ashamed of the gospel, for  
17 it is the power of God for salvation, to every one that

the *εις* is rendered, for it is *ἔτι* which signifies *after, post.* with the pronoun *ἐν ἑαυτῷ*; Greek, *ΕΙΣ αὐτοὺς*; English, *after them*. Moreover, this signification of *εις*, *after*, is not confined to one edition of the Septuagint, for, see from the Arundelliana Bibliotheca, in the first chapter of Esther, the Editio Origenica reads *μετὰ τοῦ δαΐδα αὐτοὺς ποτὶ πλουτοῖν*, while another editio vetus of better Greek reads *εις τοῦ ἐπιδοχθῆναι τὸν πλοῦτον*, *AFTER* the exhibition of his wealth. Erasmus renders *εις τοῦ στή...* ut aliquid impertiar vobis donum spirituale quo confirmemini. It cannot be expected that Calvin's is better: it is the same; aliquod... ad vos confirmandos is the only grammatical difference, which however is the vulgate, followed by our Protestant English version. The Christians of Rome *were established*, and hence the plain straightforward propriety of the phrase *after*. Similar phrases to *εις τοῦ στή...* are in general miserably rendered by great scholars. See *εις τοῦ γινώσθαι ὑμᾶς ἑτέρω*, *after* you married another; or, *after* the marriage of you to another, which is still nearer the Greek construction; see seventh of Romans. Calvin's is a horrid translation of this Greek, ut posthac alterius sitis, and so is the vulgate as well as Erasmus. *Εν δὲ τῷ πορευέσθαι*, *in the journey however*; *ἐν τῷ ἀκούειν αὐτοὺς*, *on their hearing*: so also, *διὰ τοῦ διδάσκειν αὐτοὺς τοὺς λαοὺς*. Luther's translations here are no better.

<sup>a</sup> *Προεβίμην*, *made arrangements myself*; middle voice. Hence also *ἐναγχαλιεσθῆναι*, *preach the gospel myself*; middle.

<sup>b</sup> *ἵνα, nevertheless*. The following are examples of *ἵνα*, *quamvis*, from Lucian, *ἵνα γὰρ οὐ ταῦτο πρὸς ὀλίγον ὄμηναι, τοῦ εἶναι, ὅσας ἐν ἐθελῆς, ἀποκηρυττεῖν. οὐδ' ἀσπλῆς, οἷμαι, οὐδ' ἵπαι πάσαις αἰτιαῖς ἀπεκρηγῆς ἵνα δὲ σοὶ δὴ αὐτὰ ἐκείνα μισθῶνται*; but there are many of the same meaning in the Greek Testament, to which it is unnecessary here to refer.

<sup>c</sup> *Οὕτω το κατ' ἐμὲ πρῶτον*, *hence the anxiety or eagerness in me*; but *κατ' ἐμὲ* is stronger than *in me*; *ready* or *readiness*, is the vulgar rendering of *το πρῶτον*. This however is bad. *Πρῶτον* or *το πρῶτον* should not be translated readiness, as is given by Bishop Blomfield in Gram.

truths [it], to Jew and Greek <sup>a</sup> alike. For God's justice is revealed in it from *truth* to *truth*, as it is expressed, the just indeed shall live by truth; <sup>b</sup> for God's retribution is revealed from heaven against every wickedness and *injustice* <sup>c</sup> of men that WICKEDLY

<sup>a</sup> Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἑλλήνι, to Jew and Greek alike: literally, both to Jew first and Greek, implying that there is no difference, that they are both first.

<sup>b</sup> Ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζῆται, the just indeed shall live by truth. The quotation is from Hab. מִבְּאֵמֶן, in or by his truth is the Hebrew expression: conduct founded on truth. The element of God is truth. All sons of God live in this element. Out of it, like the aquatic tribe, they die. A long and very instructive dissertation might be written on this term, πίστις or ἀληθία, in connection with the common Septuagint and the Hebrew, without which it is impossible to understand well the Greek Testament or the Gospel of Paul, both of which are synonymous. Hence see, worship God in spirit and by truth. Πίστις, as is evident from the next verse of the apostle, is only another word for ἀληθία, which he, with a perfect understanding of the subject, uses instead of πίστις. In Deuteronomy we have, as our authorized version renders πίστις of the Septuagint, *faith*; hence children in whom there is no *faith*, should be *truth*. The word however is not merely the speaking, but the doing of *truth*.

<sup>c</sup> Ἐστὶ παρὰν ἀσέβειαν καὶ ἀδικίαν, against every wickedness and injustice. Ἀσέβης, on which ἀσέβεια is grounded, derives very much of its authority from the Septuagint translation of עָוָר, a word which represents *violence* and *cruelty*, and by consequence *injustice*. Hence ἀσέβης is *unjust*, the proper designation of the *sinner*. Hence Genesis, Septuagint xviii. 25, ἀποκτενεῖς δίκαιον μετὰ ἀσέβου, *kill the just with the unjust*. In the first Psalm of our authorized version, we have *ungodly* occurring four times, translated from the word עָוָר. I have examined nearly one hundred and fifty examples of ἀσέβης in the Septuagint derived from עָוָר, independent of those of the Psalms, every one of which I have carefully revised again and again. After the first Psalm, our authorized version uses the word *wicked* for *ungodly*: a change for which no reason can be assigned. When however the Septuagint does not take ἀσέβης, it substitutes ἀμαρτωλός. Of ἀμαρτωλός, there are in the Psalms more than sixty examples; the remainder are ἀσέβης. Hence those who are concerned in this subject, and who is not? willing and able to wade through the proofs, may see that Psalm i. 1, 4, 5, 6; vii. 9; ix. 5, 15, 17; x. 2, 3, 4, 15; xi. 2, 5, 6; xii. 8; xvii. 9, 13; xxvi. 5; xxviii. 3; xxxi. 17; xxxii. 10; xxxiv. 21; xxxvi. 1, 11; xxxvii. 10, 12, 16, 17, 20, 21, 28, 32,



34, 35, 38, 40; xxxix. 1; l. 16; lv. 3; lviii. 3; lxviii. 2; lxxi. 4; lxxiii. 3, 12; lxxv. 4, 8, 10; lxxxi. 2, 4; lxxxiv. 10; xci. 8; xcii. 7; xciv. 3, 13; xcvi. 10; ci. 8; civ. 35; cvi. 6, 18; cix. 2, 6; cxii. 10; cxix. 61, 95, 110, 119; cxxv. 3; cxxix. 4; cxxxix. 19; clx. 4, 8; cxli. 4; cxlv. 20; cxli. 9; cxlvii. 6, are examples of this term עשׂר, rendered *ungodly* and *ungodliness*, or in the language of the Septuagint αἰσῆς and ἀμαρτωλός, or ἀμαρτία or αἰσῆς. The עשׂר, the *wicked*, our English word coming itself from עשׂר, *perverse*, *fraudulent individuals*, is of the same origin as the Hebrew ב or ד changed into *d* in our language for euphony—are on a careful and critical examination of the Hebrew, *plunderers*. They are represented as taking or seizing on the property of others—as persecuting the *stranger*, the just, the benevolent—as disregarding and confounding all notions of right and wrong—as laughing at all arrangements of the Eternal to counteract or destroy such monstrous conduct, and at any consequences that may result from their selfish and destructive course—as crouching in secret, like cunning wolves, prepared at the first favourable opportunity to pounce upon their unsuspecting and innocent victims—as having recourse to violent means, or taking swords in their hands, when cunning fails, to compass their unjust and cruel purposes. Such indeed are the עשׂר, the עשׂר, the oi-ck-b, the *wicked*, the *ungodly*, *sinner*s. Hear it, ye men of Christendom, all on the high road to Heaven! There are however other Hebrew words, of which דלן, עשׂר, are examples, rendered by the Septuagint αἰσῆς, αἰσῆς. As the senseless and the unlearned are always clamorous for names, I have to say here what has been repeated elsewhere, that my investigations and criticisms are all made without reference to any writer, or even without consulting any one: nevertheless I am happy to say, that here I agree with Michaelis, a superior scholar, who remarks that “it is manifest עשׂר—*wretch*o, our word *wretch*—does not signify *ungodly*, but the person in a process of law on whose side the injustice lies, or the contrary to צדק, *just*. But the seventy translate it in general by αἰσῆς, αἰσῆς, αἰσῆς; nor do they appear to have used this translation through ignorance of the Hebrew, which they have in several instances very properly translated by ἀδικός, ἀδικίαν, ἀδικίαν. In many—and he might have added in *very* many—instances, the translation *ungodly* is totally inadmissible; and it is evident that αἰσῆς, in the dialect of the Alexandrine translations, had a sense different from that which was given it by the classic authors.” This latter observation of Michaelis is a mistake. See without going farther, Euripides expressing *just*, or a kindred idea, by εὐσῆς:—

Καὶ τοῦ νόμου τ' αἰσχρὸν, εὐσῆς τ' αἰσῆς.—ORESTES, 496.

Besides, we have in the 813th verse of the same drama, αἰσῆς, and in 890th, εὐσῆς, employed in a similar sense to the passage of which we are speaking.

19 COUNTERACT *the feeling of the truth*,<sup>2</sup> because the

Το δ' αὖ κακουργῶν, ασιβία μεγάλη.—813.

... θοὶ δι σοὶ δικῆς βραβύς

Πάγουσιν ἐν Ἀριωσῇ ἑσσεὶ βίστασθην

Ἰσθον δούσαν.—ORESTES, 1668.

The gods, however, the arbiters of thy fate, will on the martial hills award thee a *most just* sentence.

Herbert Marsh, Bishop of Peterborough, in making remarks on Michaelis in reference to ασιβία, and the *ungodly*, displays neither justice, learning, nor Christianity. He knows nothing of the χριστός... οὐτε ασιβίαν ἀπιδαν, where he gravely and ignorantly says, "no one will doubt that in the last, the only notion intended to be pressed, is that of our relation to the Supreme Being." Herbert Marsh, you know little of the matter! The Syriac manuscript to which reference has already been made, expresses ασιβίαν and ἀδικίαν, by ܠܫܡܕܐ and ܠܫܡܕܐܝ, which is confirmatory of the general position. The same word, the former existing in the Hebrew, is לו, which in Ezekiel expresses cruel and unjust traffic. Ezek. xxviii. 18, בְּעוֹל רַכְלָהָ, *by the iniquity of thy traffic*, is the vulgar rendering. We see from the context of this same version what sort of merchandise and traffic it was; for the sixteenth verse says, by the multitude of thy merchandise they have filled the midst of thee with *violence*, וְכַח, to do *violence*. It is however somewhat difficult to find in our language a good generic expressive term for ασιβία, because *cruelty*, though the chief, does not contain the comprehensive signification which is desirable. Wickedness is so vague and so sectarianly rendered to suit unjust, unholy purposes, that it is also an objectionable expression. There is *impiety*, but this is so partial. The second Syriac word is the Hebrew עוֹל. *Injustice* is good, referring first to the perpetrator himself, then to his fellows, and God summed up in them both. By God causing men to reap what they sow or do, he is enabled to do justice. So that a man's foes are they of his own bosom.

<sup>2</sup> Ἀνθρώπων, τῶν τὴν ἀληθείαν ἐν ἀδικίᾳ κατεχούτων, men that wickedly *counteract the feeling* of the truth, from κατὰ, ἔχον—κατὰ, *against*, and ἔχον, *literally to have*; but this is a very partial and limited idea, and can never express the scores of phrases of which a noun following ἔχον forms a part. There is a peculiar phrase expressive of the same idea in the Acts well worthy of notice here: καὶ ἡμεῖς ψηλαφήσαμεν αὐτὸν, which is rendered by our vulgar version, *if haply they might feel after him*. This is a very clumsy and improper translation. Ψηλάζω, *to touch frequently or handle*: hence this of John, αἱ χεῖρες ἡμῶν ἐψηλάφησαν πᾶσι τοῦ λόγου τῆς ζωῆς, vulgar version,

*knowledge*<sup>a</sup> of God evidently exists within them, seeing  
 20 God has enlightened them; his very invisible quali-  
 ties, indeed, even his eternal power and Divinity, are  
 clearly obvious to the creatures from the *structure* of the  
 21 Universe;<sup>b</sup> AFTER which they are inexcusable;<sup>c</sup> be-  
 cause, though knowing God, they have not glorified or  
 thanked [him] as God, but become<sup>d</sup> mad in their rea-  
 22 sonings, and their senseless heart darkness; professing  
 23 to be wise, they have *played* the *fool*, and changed the  
 glory of the uncorrupted God<sup>e</sup> into a *form* resembling

our hands have handled of the Word of life. Ὑψηλαβαν αὐτον, frequently to *handle* or *touch* him in such a manner as to *feel* him. Hence the τοι θεος ἔχεις ἐν ὁρίῳ σου, to *feel* God in their knowledge, or as I have rendered it, to *practise* God according to their knowledge.

<sup>a</sup> Διὸς, other versions, οτι; I would as soon take the latter. Οτι το γνωστον. Here γνωστον, with the article before it, becomes a noun, *the knowledge*.

<sup>b</sup> Ὅσοις κτισίως ποσμου τοις ποιήμασι νοουμινα παθεσται, are clearly obvious to the creatures, or are clearly discerned by the creatures. Ποημα might be rendered *works*: απο κτισίως ποσμου, from the structure of the universe.

<sup>c</sup> Εἰς το νυν αὐτους ἀναπολογητους, after which they are inexcusable.

<sup>d</sup> Ἐματαιώθησαν and ἠμωρανθησαν, are used in an active and neuter sense by the Septuagint from active Hebrew verbs: in other words they derive their origin from an active or neuter Hebrew construction. Hence ἠματαιώθησαν rendered *became mad*, is not so good as could be wished; *played the fool* for ἠμωρανθησαν, is better, and expresses in an emphatic excellent phrase the senseless and atheistical conduct of the crowd of men. Μωρανω is generally rendered from מרע: hence our English word *bore*: hence οτι ἠμωρανθη σφόδρα, translated by the authorized version, *I have done very foolishly*. Sam. xxiv. 10.

<sup>e</sup> Του ἀφάρτου θειου ἐν ὁμοιωματα ἱκανος φάρτου ἀνθρώπου. It will be remarked that ἀφάρτου is rendered by me passive, *uncorrupted*; for one, among other reasons, because φάρτου is evidently used in a passive sense. A corrupted man exists, and must according to the gospel of the Christ exist under a corrupted form—that is, *de-formed*. His form corresponds with his corruption. Hence too all beings, mineral, vegetable, and animal, are known by their forms; in other words, out of their forms they are unknown; in other words, they all exist under forms peculiar to their *qualities* and dispositions. This is at once an axiom of truth, philosophy, and Christianity.

Greek verbals or nouns from the past tenses require at least generally a passive signification, such as γραπτος from γραφω; γινωσις from γινωσκω; παλις,



to the very desires of their hearts after uncleanness, to  
 25 disgrace their very bodies by means of themselves, who  
*in* [their] *wickedness* have perverted the truth of God,  
 and worshipped and served the creature instead of the  
 creator, who is blessed throughout the existences. [It is]  
 26 TRUTH! On this account God delivered them over to  
 disgraceful propensities—for even their very females  
 perverted the natural use by the act against nature;  
 27 likewise also even the males leaving the natural use of  
 the female burned with their ravidness for each other,  
 males with males practising immodesty, and receiving  
 in themselves the retribution for their wickedness which  
 28 was necessary; and seeing they did not *feel disposed to*  
*practise* <sup>a</sup> God according to [their] knowledge, God  
 delivered them over to the *unfeeling* mind, to do things  
 29 which are not *harmonious*<sup>b</sup>; filled as they are with every  
 [species of] injustice, debauchery, malignity, avarice,<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Τον Θεον ἰχυν, *to practise* God, or the God. This Greek phrase puts us in remembrance of the distinction between *gratias agere* and *habere* of the Latins. This is another example of ἰχυν; οὐκ ἰδοκίμασαν τον Θεον ἰχυν, *feel disposed to practise* God; hence to the *unfeeling* mind.

<sup>b</sup> Μη καθήκοντα, from κατὰ ἡμᾶς, *to come together*, to meet, to harmonize. The qualities here mentioned by the apostle cannot form a union; they produce discord, disunion, anarchy, misery, death. An enumeration of these death-producing qualities follows, which critically require much erudition. Ἀδίκῃ, πορνείᾳ πορνείᾳ, πλινιξίᾳ, κακίᾳ· μιστοὺς φθόνου, φόνου, ἱριδος, δόλου, κακοῦθιαι· ψιθυρίσται, καταλαλοῦντες, θιστογυῖαι, υβρισταί, υπεργηφονοῦντες, πλᾶζοντες, ἰφωρίσται κακῶν, γονισιν αἰσχυρῶν, αἰσχυρίσται, αἰσχυρίσται, αἰσχυρίσται, αἰσχυρίσται, αἰσχυρίσται, αἰσχυρίσται, αἰσχυρίσται.

It will be observed, that the first five words have a mutual influence over each other through the terminations *εια, γμα, ρια, ξια*. There is, moreover, the commencing sounds *πρῶν, πορ, πλ*, which could *not* be uttered or written by Paul without being felt, seen, understood, designed.

<sup>c</sup> Πλινιξίᾳ, *avarice*, which appears at least as good a word as covetousness. Erasmus, Melancthon, vulgate, *avaritia*. Melancthon thinks *πορνεία, cupiditatem nocendi*. He gives Domitian as *πορνεός*, desirous of hurting; cui hoc ipsum voluptati est nocere aliis; that is, to whom this very tendency to hurt others gives pleasure. There are many like Domitian. These are chil-

### 32 *less, merciless*, who, though knowing the condemnation

which is rendered by the vulgar version *treacherous*. It is not bad. The Greek word *ἀσυνετός* comes from *α*, *syn*, *τίθημι*—not—to place—together. *Thoughtless* is in one very strong philosophic sense, good; even *treacherous* is philosophically founded on thoughtlessness. No man or woman would be treacherous if they looked into the consequences. It is badness and ignorance combined. *Father, forgive them, they know not what they do, says the Christ within the good*. How often would I have gathered you as a hen gathers her chickens under her wings, but you *would not*; therefore your house is left unto you a desolation. *Treacherous* is the only word that rivals *thoughtless*; but *ἀσυνετός* is sometimes used for *ἀσυνίτου* by different translators of the Septuagint.

*Ἀσπέργους*, *heartless*, from *α* and the perfect middle of *σπέργω*, *to desire, to love*. Hence *σπέρμι*; English, *stern*; *pectus*, the breast, the heart situated in that place. *Σπέργω, ἰσπέργω, σπέργη, σπέργος, hearty*, with the negative prefix *α*, *ασπέργος, heartless*.

*Ἀσυνίδος*, *faithless*, from *α* and the perfect middle of *συνίδω, ἰσυνίδα, συνίδη, συνίδος*. The verb refers to libations which were anciently poured over the celebration of treaties. With the negative *a faithless*: of course not the common sermonizing expression *faithless* of false Christians. It designates those whom no treaties can bind. The Doway version has *without fidelity*. We have heard of Punic *faith*.

*Ἀνίλημνος*, *merciless*, a very powerful Greek word in every point of view; in sight, in sound, in sense, in feeling. It speaks like the rest of its companions to the eye and to the ear, and to the head and to the heart; apart altogether from the united brotherhood, of which it forms one of the last powerful links and strongholds, it is literally a host in itself. *Unmerciful*, a better word than *merciless*, from its sound would be here destitute of the combined power of the negative *less*, although it would approach nearer the Greek term *ανίλημνος*, which is composed of six syllables, without however any reference at all to its peculiar position in the sentence, and its ramifying Greek negative alpha. *Merciless* forms and binds together the preceding fraternity, from which it derives a considerable share of power, similar but not equal to the Greek. No translation of our language, however, can equal the Greek combination. Besides, the *απειθείς* is not capable of being exhibited in our idiom with the arrangements of sense and expression of the Greek language. It stands next to *ἀσυνίτου*, with a prospective reference to the succeeding negatives *α, α, α, α, α*, bearing a decided reflective reference to the noun *γόνιμνος*, which it governs. We have no such word as *dutiless*. But with all this arrangement of thought, of literature, and expression, it cannot be said to rival the Greek. It is perhaps, however, the best that our language can present. John Calvin, for *πῖπληρωμίνους* gives *ut essent pleni*. What could induce you to translate thus?

of God, that they who practise <sup>a</sup> such things are worthy of death, not only do them, but even delight in those  
 1 that practise [them]. II. Therefore thou art inexcusable, O man ! whosoever thou art that condemnest ;  
 for, in the <sup>b</sup> condemnation which thou dost pass upon the other, thou dost condemn thyself, seeing <sup>c</sup> thou who  
 2 condemnest dost practise the very same deeds. We know ourselves, however, that the retribution of God is according to truth, in those that practise such actions.  
 3 Dost thou nevertheless <sup>d</sup> think this, O man ! who condemnest those that practise such deeds, even whilst thou art doing the same, that thou thyself shalt escape <sup>e</sup> the  
 4 retribution of God ? Or, dost thou consider the riches of his goodness and forbearance and long-suffering, foolishness, <sup>f</sup> ignorant as thou art that the goodness of  
 5 God leads thee to repentance ? In *proportion* <sup>g</sup> how-

<sup>a</sup> Οἱ τε ταῦτα πράσσοντες,, who practise such things ; literally, are practising ; it is the present participle. What will the cunning, insolent, selfish, heartless, think of this ? Worthy of death ! Are they not ? This sentence is well terminated with *πράσσουσι*. There is no back door for the bad here to escape ; *knowing the condemnation*, δικαίωμα, comes from the perfect passive of *δικαίω*, freely, *justice worked out*. Paul passes from *πράσσω* to *ποιοῦ*, and from *ποιοῦ* to *πράσσω*, both signifying the same thing.

<sup>b</sup> Κρίματα is used in some versions before *κρίνεις*, which is often used for *κατακρίνεις*.

<sup>c</sup> Γὰρ, *seeing*. Οἶδαμιν, of the next verse, is the middle : hence we know ourselves.

<sup>d</sup> Δε, *nevertheless* : καὶ ποιοῦς ταῦτα, even whilst thou art doing the same. Hence too, Euripides, οὐ γὰρ ζῶ κακός, φασ δ' ἑμ. —ORES. 380.

<sup>e</sup> Ἐφ' ἑαυτῇ, future middle. I have thrown the middle expression, *thyself*, between the nominative and the verb *thou, thyself*. Compare this translation with the miserable vulgar and unlearned authorized and Doway translations. It will bear an investigation.

<sup>f</sup> Καταφρονέεις. Dost thou consider foolishness ? The foolishness is thrown forward. Μακροθυμία, the Latin men render this *longanimity*. I should like to translate it *magnanimity*.

<sup>g</sup> Κατὰ, in *proportion*. It will be seen that men reap what they do. The horrid impious notions which are circulated in the name of the true Christ

ever to thy hardness and impenitent heart, thou dost treasure up to thyself wrath in the day of wrath, and  
 6 the uncovering of the just retribution of God, who will  
 7 render to each according to his works, to those verily who by patience in good works seek glory and honour  
 8 and immortality,<sup>a</sup> eternal life; to those however of strife, and who evidently disobey the truth<sup>b</sup> obedient  
 9 however to injustice, wrath and retribution. Misery and anguish [in short] to every soul of man that does  
 10 evil, Jew and Greek alike; but glory and honour and peace to every one that practises the good, Jew and  
 11 Greek alike; for there is no acceptance of the face<sup>c</sup>  
 12 with God. For as many as have sinned<sup>c</sup> without a law, shall even destroy *themselves* without a law, and as many as have sinned<sup>d</sup> with a law shall be condemned

are well worthy of a barbarous age. Fools do one thing and look for another. Look at this, ye wise men—in the day or moment of wrath.

<sup>a</sup> Δοξαν και τιμην και αθανασiam; and at the tenth verse, Δοξα δι και τιμη και κρηνη. We see here the cause of the conjunctions. Hence, Homer:

Διξαρμνη τε, και Αμφιομη, και παλλισιυρα  
 Δωρις και Παιωση, και αγκλιτη Γαλατια.  
 Αθηνη τε Αιμον τε και Αλγια δακευοιντα.—HESIOD.

No useless conjunctions here, however, with Paul, ασποργους, ασπινδους, ανηλιημενας.

<sup>b</sup> Αληθεια, *truth* contemplates truth, nearly, if not altogether synonymous with justice. In short, there can be no justice without truth; selfishness producing selfishness, anger producing anger, cunning producing cunning, debauchery producing debauchery; cunning working against cunning, produces justice; selfishness working against candour and benevolence, creates injustice. A good tree produces good fruit, is the *truth* of the light from Heaven; and this fruit is the ζωην αιωνιον, the *eternal life*. Hear it, you who have ears to hear.

<sup>c</sup> Ου γαρ ιστι προσωποληψια παρα Θεου. Παρα Θεου, with God: men give the face of good to men. They resemble the salmon that hides its head under a stone, and imagines that the body is not seen.

<sup>d</sup> Ημαρτον, the second aorist. This Greek tense frequently carries with it a present as well as a past time. This sentence here should be *sinned and continue to sin*,—at once applicable to the people of England as those before



- 13 by a law, for the hearers of the law are not just with  
 14 God, but the doers of the law.<sup>a</sup> For whenever the Gen-  
 tiles, not in possession of the law, do by nature the duties  
 of the law, these, though not in possession of a law, are a  
 15 law unto themselves, who exhibit<sup>b</sup> themselves the me-  
 chanism of the law written in their hearts, their con-  
 science confirming [it], and their reasonings continually  
 accusing, or it may be, excusing one another.
- 17 If thou<sup>c</sup> however misname thyself a Jew, and lean  
 18 upon the law, and boast in God whilst thou knowest his  
 will, dost even experience the differences of things in-  
 19 structed as thou art out of the law, hast even thou per-  
 suaded thyself that thou thyself art a leader of the blind,  
 20 a light of those that exist in darkness, an instructor of  
 fools, a teacher of babes, thou in possession [merely] of  
 21 the form of knowledge and the truth in the law? Thou  
 therefore that teachest another, dost thou not teach thy-  
 self? Thou that preachest do not steal, dost thou steal?  
 22 Thou that sayest do not commit adultery, dost thou  
 commit adultery? Thou that abhorrest idols, dost thou

the rise of the apostles. The *νομος*, or law here, is merely the *rites* and *ceremonies* and *external writing* of the law, which cannot give life. Men are damned unless they *do* the law which is written within their heads and hearts. The doing of this law is eternal life; it is nevertheless *a gratuity* or *grace*, for it comes from God. Thou hast nothing, O man, which thou hast not received! *Απολούνται*, is middle. Hence destroy themselves.

<sup>a</sup> *Δικαιωθῆσονται*, I have left out for farther consideration.

<sup>b</sup> *Οἷτινες ἐνδύκνυται τὸ ἔργον τοῦ νομοῦ γραπτόν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν*. This is a very remarkable passage; it deserves to be written in gold, on our door-posts, on our churches and chapels, and at the top and bottom of the Lord's prayer. It is the Lord's prayer. *Ενδύκνυται*, middle; *τὸ ἔργον*, the *mechanism*; a better word by far than *work*. *Ἡ καὶ*, or *if may be*; this is a free translation for *καὶ*; but it is the sense and the meaning of the apostle. *Εἰ ἡμεῖς . . . Χριστοῦ*, I have left out for farther consideration.

<sup>c</sup> *Εἰ δὲ*, with Griesback and others, I prefer to *ἰδὲ*. This sentence beginning with *ἰδὲ* is finished at *ἀληθῶς ἐν τῷ νόμῳ*, which I consider interrogative. It is miserably mangled both by the Latin and vulgar translations. There is some difficulty.

23 idolize<sup>a</sup> thyself? Thou that boastest in the law, dost  
 24 through the breaking of the law dishonour God, for  
 the name of God is through you reviled, as it is ex-  
 25 pressed, among the people. Circumcision is verily  
 indeed useful if thou do the law; but if thou art a  
 breaker of the law, thy circumcision has made itself  
 26 uncircumcision. If then the uncircumcision practise<sup>b</sup>  
 the duties of the law, shall not the uncircumcision of  
 27 that man be considered circumcision? The uncircum-  
 cision of nature perfecting the law even<sup>c</sup> condemns  
 thee, the literal and circumcisional breaker of the law.  
 28 For the [Jew] externally is not the Jew, nor [is] the  
 29 [circumcision] externally in the flesh circumcision; but  
 the [Jew] internally is the Jew, even the circumcision  
 of the heart, in spirit not in the letter, whose praise is  
 not of men but of God!

1 III. What then [is] the superiority of the Jew? Or  
 2 what the utility of circumcision? Much in every<sup>d</sup> point  
 of view [say some]: chiefly indeed, however, because<sup>e</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Ο βδελυσσομινος τα ἰδωλα, ἱεροσυλεις, thou that abhorrest idols, dost thou idolize thyself? or dost thou make thyself a Jerusalem for the purpose of going up to worship? I consider it composed of *ιερος*, sacer, holy; and *ἐλε*, *scandit*, *ascendit*, *conscendit*, or *oblatus fuit super altare*, העלה על המזבח. Judg. vi. 28. Hence *על*, excelsus: hence also *עלה*: hence *מעלה*, gradus, dignitas. See too *עלה*. Here all learned men have stopped. Between the abhorring of idols and the commission of sacrilege, which is the vulgar and even Latin translation, there is no connection. It is nonsense. Erasmus, sacrilegium admittis; Calvin's is the vulgar translation, and indeed so is Eras, qui detestaris idola, sacrilegium perpetrās?

<sup>b</sup> Φυλάσσει τα δικαιώματα, practise the duties. Φυλάσσω is another word for *ποιῶ* and *πράσσω*. What do you say to this you *faith-men*?

<sup>c</sup> Καὶ κρίνει, even condemns; τὸν διὰ γραμμάτων καὶ περιτομῆς παραβάτην νόμου, might be translated *the literal or the real and circumcisional breaker of the law*. Τίλωση, perfecting, is present part.

<sup>d</sup> Κατὰ πάντα τρόπον, I look upon as a general eloquent phrase.

<sup>e</sup> Ὅτι πιστιώθησαν τα λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ, because they did credit the declarations of God. Though *πιστιώθησαν* is passive, it does not affect the case.

- 3 they did credit the declarations of God. What matters it <sup>a</sup> if some did not credit them? Shall their incredulity  
 4 affect <sup>b</sup> the truth of God? Never! Let God, in short, be made true and every man a liar,<sup>c</sup> as it is expressed, that thou mayest be just in thy words and innocent in  
 5 thy <sup>d</sup> condemnation. If, however, our injustice <sup>e</sup> con-

This mode of expression takes its origin from the Septuagint usages, as well as from Greek writers themselves. But, indeed, there is no necessity for entering into this with those who have investigated the translations of the Septuagint. The same mode of expression is used in Timothy, *ο πιστιυθην ιγω*; and also Titus, *ο πιστιυθη ιγω*. *λογω*, or *λογια*, from *לומר*, might be rendered *doings*, for it refers to God's doings in man and the universe—just in thy doings, and innocent in thy condemnation. Doings are the words of God; nevertheless *the God speaks in man*. This is the philosophy of the subject which our pseudo-philosophers and trifling chemical men sneakingly abun. The Alexandrine *πισυθησαν*. The Greek has a great superiority over the English: hence, *πιστιυθησαι, πιστησων, απιστια, πιστιν*, all speaking to the eye and the ear, and the understanding. Professor Fredericus Tholuck, of Halle, whose Romans before sending this of Romans to the press I have just looked at, makes, as I do, *λογια* the objective. His critical remarks are better than Moses Stuart's of America, yet he does not understand the scriptures. *Εις το νυναι* is not used frequently for *οστι*, at least by Paul, as you Fredericus Tholuck say. You must reconsider the matter after this translation!

<sup>a</sup> *Τι γαρ*, what matters it? In the same sense do I render this of Euripides:

*Τι γαρ? φιλον μαι πατρος εστιν ιαγειος.*

<sup>b</sup> *Καταργησω*, affect, or counteract, or destroy, composed of *κατα* and *ργη*, *arg. texuit*.

<sup>c</sup> *Ψευστης*, a liar, practical lying, doing lies.

<sup>d</sup> *Ὅπως αν δικαιωθης εν ταις λογοις σου, και νικησης εν τω κρινεσθαι σοι*. My translation is evident from the context without any actual reference. It is a quotation from the Septuagint. Psalm li. 4. The Hebrew is *למען תצדק במשפטך*. *Νικησης*, is the reading of Theodotian; *υπεριβιθης*, of Aquila, a much better word and more easily understood by those not versed in the subject. *וכה*, *purus, mundus fuit*. There is no difficulty here; but it may be as well to say that the Greek verb *νικω* used in this passage, is the very Hebrew word *נקה* changed into Greek letters, which means *mundus, innocent*. The lexicon men give to *νικω*, *vinco, to conquer*. All truth and justice conquer. Hence the philosophy of the word.

<sup>e</sup> *Συνιστησι*, *constitutes*. You may see here Paul's gospel, and the truth of the *χριστος*.

- stitutes* God's justice, what shall we say? Is God who  
 6 inflicts retribution, unjust? I speak as a man. Never!  
 Otherwise, how shall God do justice to the world?  
 7 For if God's truth has furthered through my lying his  
 8 glory, why am I after this condemned as a liar? And  
 [why] not [rather say], as we are maliciously described,  
 and as some affirm that we do say, let us do evil that  
 9 good may come, whose condemnation is just. What  
 then? Do we prefer ourselves? Certainly not! For  
 we have ourselves already criminated both <sup>a</sup> Jews and  
 Greeks, all existing under sin. ....  
 ....  
 19 We know ourselves, however, that what things soever  
 the law says, it says to those under the law, let every  
 mouth be stopped, and all the world plead guilty to  
 20 God. Wherefore by works of the law NOT ALL FLESH  
 shall be justified <sup>b</sup> in his sight; for by the law is the  
 21 knowledge of sin. Evidently, however, without the law

<sup>a</sup> Πεντηκισμῶτα, *we ourselves have already criminated*. It is middle. The verses that follow are passed by. I do not believe them to be Paul's. It is not necessary to ask, like the Scholiast, whence Paul got them: no, nor is it necessary, to say ignorantly, as Hartley Horne, who has written a great deal to little purpose, does, that Paul must have had another copy. The mountain labours and brings forth a mouse! We assert that he did not put them there; that they have been pushed into the Septuagint, but when we are not at present going to inquire; neither is it necessary to talk of names for strengthening this authority. To please however the senseless and unlearned, honest or dishonest, who are always clamorous for names, without however being able to form a judgment of the names when given, we may as well find room for the collected knowledge of one learned man well known in Christendom, Hieronymus, who says in Latin, writing as he does in this language to the learned, *omnes Græciæ tractatores, qui nobis eruditionis suæ in Psalmos commentarios reliquerunt, hos versiculos veru annotant atque prætereunt; liquido confidentes in Hebraico non haberi, nec esse in Septuaginta interpretibus, sed in editione vulgata, quæ Græcæ αὐτῶν dicitur, et in toto orbe diversa est.*

<sup>b</sup> Οὐ δικαιωθήσεται πᾶσα σαρκίς, NOT ALL FLESH shall be justified. The animal man cannot justify itself. *Nun di, evidently, however.*

God's justice is manifested, confirmed as it is under the  
 22 law and the prophets; God's justice, however, by the  
 truth of Jesus Christ to all and over all those that  
 23 credit [it]. For<sup>a</sup> there is no difference? For all have  
 24 sinned and *stand in*<sup>b</sup> need of the glory of God, *justified*<sup>c</sup> as they are freely by his grace through the re-  
 25 demption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God formerly


<sup>a</sup> Οὐ γὰρ ἔστι διαστολή, For there is no difference? You might read *ου*, not the negation, but the adverb *where*; does not affect the sense much, not like that of Galatians, which reads nonsense.

<sup>b</sup> Ὑστρίζονται τῆς δόξης τοῦ Θεοῦ, *stand in need of the glory of God*, or, as it might be, *grace of God*.

<sup>c</sup> Δικαιοῦνται ὧρται ἐν αὐτοῦ χάριτι διὰ τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ὃν ἀρεθίτε ὁ Θεὸς ἱλαστήριος διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι εἰς ἰνδιξίν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ, ὧς τὴν παρίειν τῶν προηγούμενων ἁμαρτημάτων ἐν τῇ ἀνεχῇ σου Θεοῦ πρὸς ἰνδιξίν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ ἰν καίρῳ, ὡς τοῦ ναίει αὐτοῦ δικαίον καὶ δικαιῶντα τὸν ἐν πίστει Ἰησοῦ. Some difficulty has attended this passage in consequence of the reading of the scriptures being lost, and purposely destroyed. The reasoning too is exceedingly close, which renders it more difficult for the crowd. Πρὸς ἰνδιξίν, *from a demonstration*. See πρὸς, *from*, governing the accusative in Orestes.

..... Πρὸς οὐχ' ἀπαντας ευκλῆαν φέρειν.

But there are several examples of the Greek scriptures of *πρὸς*, *from*, into which we will not enter. Εἰς τοῦ ναίει, might have been rendered according to the existence of himself just; but the sense is the same. The vulgar, and even learned translations of this passage, are most wretched.

 DOCTRINE. The whole matter applies to this life, to the state of existence on this world, the earth! Hence parents by doing injustice and cruelty, entail first upon themselves, then upon their children, begotten in the midst of, or after these sins, which have arisen from the forbearance of God FOR a demonstration of his justice in the present existence—on earth. Hence these unjust, debauched, or cruel children, are demonstrations of God's justice. Had every unjust, cruel, or treacherous act been punished with immediate corporeal death, or a termination of the individual's existence as a matter of justice, there would have been, according to the apostle, no *ανεχῇ*, *forbearance*, on the part of God. The salvation of cruel, unjust, treacherous, senseless children, depends upon their following the truth of the Lord of them, Jesus Christ, who is within them, nearly synonymous with the mechanism of the law of the constitution of man, or as the apostle calls it, *the mechanism of their hearts and minds*.

arranged to be a propitiation through the truth in his  
 26 blood for a demonstration of his justice, by the remission of the sins that previously arose through the forbearance of God from a demonstration of his justice in the present time, after his own just nature, and the justifier of the [son] of the truth of Jesus.  
 27 Where then the boasting? It is excluded. By what  
 28 law? Of works? No, but by the law of truth. For we conclude that man is justified by the truth with-  
 29 out the works of the law. Is he the God only of the Jews? Not also of the Gentiles? Certainly also of the  
 30 Gentiles! Seeing it is one God who will justify the circumcision by truth, and the uncircumcision through  
 31 the truth, do we therefore destroy the law through the truth? By no means! Undoubtedly we establish the  
 1 law. IV. What then shall we say that Abraham, the  
 2 father of us, in reference to the flesh has found? For if Abraham was justified by works, he boasts, but not  
 3 against God. For what says the scripture? Abraham, indeed, trusted in God: and [this] reckoned to him  
 4 justice.<sup>a</sup> To him however that works, the reward is  
 5 not considered a gratuity, but a debt; while to him that does not work, but trusts in him that justifies the  
*unjust*,<sup>b</sup> the truth of this man is considered justice.  
 6 Hence also David speaks of the *happiness*<sup>c</sup> of the man  
 7 to whom God reckons justice without works. Happy they whose *prevarications* are taken away and whose

<sup>a</sup> Ελογισθη αυτο εις δικαιοσυνην, it is difficult to get a good word in our language for ελογισθη, which in the Hebrew is not passive. *Reckoned and became* are given as specimens. There is no occasion for *us*; being rendered.


<sup>b</sup> Δικαιουντα τον ασιβη, justifies the unjust. See ια: πασαν ασιβιαν.

<sup>c</sup> Μακαρισμον, happiness, but not blessedness. Men can be happy only by one way; that is, by DOING good, DOING justice, HATING cruelty. There is no other decree. A bad man every where, and in all circumstances, must be miserable. He is condemned. It is the feeling of the truth within that damns him.

8 crimes are covered! *Happy* the man to whom God  
 9 will not impute injustice! Does this happiness then  
 [belong] to the circumcision, or also to the uncircumci-  
 sion? For we affirm that the truth became to Abraham  
 10 justice. WHEN<sup>a</sup> therefore did it become? To him in  
 the state of circumcision or uncircumcision? Not in  
 11 circumcision, but in uncircumcision. He even took the  
 rite of circumcision, a seal of the justice of the truth,  
 which exists in the uncircumcision AFTER<sup>b</sup> he was

<sup>a</sup> Πως, *when*. This, I am of course perfectly aware, is an extraordinary translation! It is not the *how*, ye lovers of truth, but the *when*, about which Paul is so very anxious. *Οτι, to him-existing; Εν, in the state.*

<sup>b</sup> Εἰς το ἵνα αὐτοὶ πατέρα—Εἰς το λογισθῆναι καὶ αὐτοῖς—*us το δεξιμαζιν υμας τι το διλημα—us το δεξιμαζιν υμας τα διαφειροντα*, and such phrases are most miserably rendered both by the learned and the unlearned. Calvin's for the *us το ἵνα αὐτοὶ* is, *ut esset pater*. It is unnecessary to bring in here the learned ignorance of James Scholefield, Professor of Greek at Cambridge, were it not that some homunculi may attach to his lucubrations an unworthy importance. In his clumsy unintelligible translation, "for therein is the righteousness of God revealed, *being* by faith unto faith," I understand, says he, *us πιστιν* to be equivalent to *εις το πιστιναι*, to the end that we may believe or may receive it by faith. This use of the preposition *us*, as marking the end of an action, is very common with St. Paul, especially in this Epistle." *Εἰς το πιστιναι ημας*, signifies AFTER we believe, or it may be, did believe. *Τοις ὡς βαπτισθῆναι us χριστον Ἰησουν, us τον θανατον αὐτου βαπτισθῆναι, συνταφημιν οὐ αὐτω δια του βαπτισματος us τον θανατον*, that is, as many of us as were baptized AFTER Christ Jesus, were baptized AFTER his death; we were then buried with him in baptism AFTER death. Men bury *after* and not *before* or *unto* death. Look here Professor Scholefield, and Professor Tholuck, of the university of Halle, your *Εἰς το* as equivalent for *οστι*, is *σκοτος*—is the *οδηγῳ τυφλοι τυφλων*. Take another example, 2 Thes. ii. 11, *Καὶ δια τουτο πικρυ αὐτοις ο θιος ενεργειαν πλανης Εἰς το πιστιναι αὐτους τω ψευδι*, that is, Professors, God will send them the in-working, or the internal working, or if you will, *lies* of wickedness AFTER they have believed, or trusted, or simply *believe* the lie. God is not so bad as our unjust horrid versions make him. He sends them the *ενεργειαν πλανης*, the consequences of their departure from the truth, not BEFORE but AFTER Εἰς they themselves have made themselves liars. See note on *us το εστη* . . . I have introduced a new word, *circumcisional*, for the purpose of coming nearer the Greek, and rendering the expression better and stronger.


 DOCTRINE. Abraham became a father, *us το λογισθῆναι καὶ αὐτοῖς την*

[the] father of all that believe during uncircumcision, AFTER the imputation of the justice also to these, 12 even a father of circumcision to those not of circumcision only, but also to those that walk in the steps of the truth of our father Abraham in the state of uncir- 13 cumcision. Hence the declaration to Abraham and his seed, that he is the heir of the world, [comes] not through the law, but through the justice of the truth. 14 For if they of the law [are] heirs, the truth is useless, 15 and the declaration destroyed. The law verily works destruction.<sup>a</sup> Where however<sup>b</sup> there is not a law, 16 neither is there a transgression! Therefore [it is] of the truth, *nevertheless*<sup>c</sup> a gratuity, after<sup>d</sup> the nature of the firm declaration to all the seed, not to the [son] of the law only, but also to the [son] of the truth of 17 Abraham, who is [the] father of us all; as it is expressed, I have made thee a father of many people; in the view of which he trusted in God, who makes the dead 18 live, and calls things not existing as really existing; who from hope to hope believed AFTER he<sup>e</sup> made himself a

δικαιοσύνην, AFTER the imputation of the justice to those or them; that is, those who were prior to Abraham in any corner of the earth, who DID the spirit of the truth.

<sup>a</sup> Οργή, destruction or wrath.

<sup>b</sup> Ου γὰρ, others, ου δι. This is the same phrase as that which Paul uses in Galatians. Οἷς ου δι, to whom, where, however.

 DOCTRINE. Before the introduction of the Jewish law, there was of course no law; *ergo*, there could be no transgression! Hence the law that justifies or condemns men is the law of the truth, which existed as strongly and vividly before as after the introduction of the common Jewish ceremonial and table law.

<sup>c</sup> Ινα, *nevertheless*. ΙΝΑ χαρὰς πληρωθῶ, NEVERTHELESS I should be filled with joy. 2 Tim. i. 3. Εαν δι βραδυνῶ, ΙΝΑ ἴδῃς πῶς δι ἀναστρεφίσθαι, that is, But if I tarry long, NEVERTHELESS thou shouldst know how thou oughtest to conduct yourself. 1 Tim. iii. 15.

<sup>d</sup> Εἰς το ναίαι βιβῆαι τὴν σωγγίλιαν, might be rendered according to the existence or stability of.

<sup>e</sup> Εἰς το γινῆσθαι αὐτὸν πατέρα, after he made himself, or, if you will, after




father of many people, according to the <sup>a</sup> saying, so  
 19 shall thy seed be : and not being weak in the truth, he,  
 though nearly a hundred years old, did not consider  
 his own body already dead, and the death of Sarah's  
 20 womb. After, however,<sup>b</sup> the declaration of God, he  
 did not give way to incredulity, but was strong in the  
 21 truth, giving glory to God, even fully persuaded that  
 he who had made the declaration is also able to put it  
 22 in practice. [This] therefore became to him justice.  
 23 [The expression] however that it *became to him* was  
 24 not written for him only, but also for us, to whom it  
 is to become, to those that trust <sup>c</sup> in him that raised  
 [and continues to raise] Jesus the Lord of us from the  
 25 dead, who was delivered for our injustices, and raised  
 for our justification.

he became, or after the becoming of him, which is not good English. No  
*ut esset pater* here, Professors, which is Calvin, the vulgate, and a host  
 of others *ut esset heres*, with Calvin, for ΑΤΤΟΝ ΕΙΝΑΙ.

<sup>a</sup> Κατα το ιρημινον, according to the saying, from the perfect participle of  
 ιρημαι, identified with ιαγγελια, declaration. No promises.

<sup>b</sup> Εις δε την ιαγγελιαν του Θεου, AFTER however the declaration of God.  
 Another, ις το, ηστι ; for you, τυφλοι.

<sup>c</sup> Της πιστευουσιν επι τον ιγυζαντα Ιησουν τον κυριον ημων εκ νεκρων, to those  
 that trust in him that raised and continues to raise, Jesus the Lord of us,  
 as the Syriac expresses it, ܡܢ ܒܝܬ ܡܝܬܝܡ, from among the dead—house  
 of the dead.

 DOCTRINE. The resurrection is always going on. What is the mean-  
 ing of being baptized for the dead, as your version translates ?

*We now beg to close for the present our continued translation  
 of Romans.*

*The following Extract is given for the exhibition of the Greek preposition ΕΙΣ, signifying AFTER. The passage besides exhibits the notions of Paul and those of that period and country of adultery; and the application of the simile of marriage to the resurrection of the dead.*

1 CHAP. VII. KNOW you not, brethren, for I speak to  
those that know law, that the law domineers over the  
2 man during life? For the woman under a husband  
is bound by law to the husband while he lives; but  
if the husband die, she is relieved from the law of  
3 the husband. Certainly, then, she *shall be guilty*<sup>a</sup> of  
adultery, if during the life of the husband, she marry  
another man. If however the husband die, she is re-  
leased from the law; she is not an adulteress though she  
4 marry another man. Even so you, my brethren, became  
dead to the law throughout the body of the Messiah  
AFTER<sup>b</sup> you married another, Him who was raised from  
the dead.

<sup>a</sup> *Xenouariou, she shall be guilty.* The word does not imply any thing like CALLING. *Xenouariζω*, from *χρημα*, *res, negotium, things, realities*, not *names*: it is guilty or not guilty; with the personification of the verb ΤΙΖΩ, I am *χρημα*, the *thing* or *substance*, or more actively, *I commit*.

<sup>b</sup> *ΕΙΣ το γινώσκειν υμᾶς ἑτερον*, AFTER THE MARRIAGE OF YOU TO ANOTHER; or, as I have rendered it above, AFTER YOU MARRIED ANOTHER. The article TO before a Greek infinitive, particularly of the past tenses, makes the verb elegantly a noun. *ΓΙΝΩσκαι*, from γιγν or GIN or GEN, *pro- tectit, a garden*, because protected; *fruit of the garden; produce or seed*, becomes with ΔΕΙΞ ΓΓ, *lapis*, *gen-der*, *gan-der*. *Γινώσκει*, the middle voice, authorizes the translation MARRY HERSELF, which, while the active quality of the verb is preserved in the translation, is not in all cases absolutely necessary to our idiom.

*Chapter VIII. is important but difficult, let us therefore give a few Extracts before leaving Romans.*

1 Now certainly there [is] no condemnation to those  
 2 in the Messiah Saviour? For the law <sup>a</sup> of the spirit of  
 3 life has freed me from the law of sin and death. For  
 the incapacity of the law—where it displays weakness  
 over the flesh—<sup>b</sup>condemned wickedness in the flesh—  
 4 that the perfection of the law should be realized in us,  
 5 who walk not fleshly but spiritually. For <sup>c</sup> the fleshly  
 are prone to the things of the flesh, the spiritual how-  
 6 ever to the things of the spirit. For the tendency of  
 the flesh is death, the tendency however of the spirit is  
 7 life and peace. Therefore the tendency of the flesh is  
 hostile to God; for it is not subject to the law of God,  
 8 neither indeed is it capable. The fleshly however can-  
 11 not be acceptable to God. .... If the spirit  
 of the Raiser of the Saviour from the dead dwells in  
 you, the Raiser of the Anointed from the dead will  
 13 make even your MORTAL BODIES LIVE. .... If you  
 live fleshly, you shall die; but if you do mortify in  
 spirit the doings of the body, you shall make YOUR-  
 17 SELVES LIVE. .... If indeed sons, also heirs,  
 heirs verily of God, fellow heirs indeed of the Messiah;  
 if we are fellow sufferers, it is our duty to be also fellow  
 23 glorified. .... Not only [they] indeed, but even  
 ourselves in possession of the rise of the spirit, even we

---

<sup>a</sup> Michaelis proposes, Ο νόμος του πνευματος ΚΑΙ ζωης, to contrast, as he thinks, better with αμαρτίας ΚΑΙ του θανατου. Δικαιωμα, I have rendered here *perfection* for a specimen, the justice of the law is its *perfection*. Φρονημα is a difficult word to give into our language. *Wisdom* may have some connection, but this is not the very thing. Φρονημα explains Δικαιωμα, but neither can be well translated. *Perfection* has some distant approximating conception. Has PRONENESS any connection with the root of Φρον? Μιλλιστι αποθησκου is not a common phrase of Paul.

<sup>b</sup> Some difficulty attends this third verse: I don't condemn it, but I leave it for the present.

<sup>c</sup> Literally, they EXISTING, or rather LIVING fleshly.

ourselves feel miserably confined within ourselves, though  
 WE TAKE FROM THE SONSHIP, THE REDEMPTION OF OUR  
 BODY !

---

*We here enter upon a very different writer and a different style from that of Paul. Let us however beware of passing a hasty verdict, either on the style, the intelligence, or disposition of John the holy Evangelist.*

1 In eternity<sup>a</sup> was the Word and the Word was with  
 2 God, and God was the Word. This was in eternity  
 3 with God. All things made themselves<sup>b</sup> through Him ;  
 and without Him, not even one thing made itself which  
 4 has made itself. In Him was Life, and the Life was  
 5 the Light of men. And the Light shines in the dark-  
 6 ness, and the darkness has not confounded<sup>c</sup> It. A man

---

Such, indeed, is the translation of the celebrated introduction of the Apostle John, about which all sects for these seventeen hundred years have been eternally contending. The one-eyed, as much as the ignorant construction of things has presented a frightful picture of the plainest and most obvious conceptions of the Greek and state of man ; yet false Christians WILL not see it. Let them however understand through John, that every *man should believe through the Light*. Our holy apostle tells them that they *ought to believe through the Light*, yet they cling to him, and sneakily shun his eternal declaration on the subject of the Light, which they continue to crucify. Ω μαι ιγαν!!! Ω μαι ιγαν!!!

<sup>a</sup> Αεχην, *Eternity*. The context, and many other expressions of John, of which there can be no doubt calls loudly for this translation. How it is possible for any except the ignorant to give another version, is to me a matter of wonder. Tittmann, of the university of Leipsic, who has written a large exegetical volume on John, has very properly remarked, that the most ancient interpreters take the side of Eternity. The το . . . ιν αεχην, says he, de æternitate explicarunt interpretes antiquissimi. Chrysostom takes this side and enters strongly into the argument.

<sup>b</sup> Παντα εγινετο, *all things made or created themselves*. The verb ΓΙΝΟΜΑΙ evidently conveys the idea of creation. There is no doubt about this.

<sup>c</sup> Κατελαβεν, *confounded*. Some difficulty attends the precise meaning which John may have attached to this word. Michaelis says, that he does not understand exactly the force of κατελαβεν.

whose name was John appeared,<sup>a</sup> after having been sent  
 7 from God. This came for a testimony, though it was  
 his duty to testify of the Light, though it was the duty  
 8 of all to believe through It. He was not the Light,  
 nevertheless<sup>b</sup> it was his duty to testify of the Light.  
 9 The true Light which enlightens every man coming<sup>c</sup>  
 10 into the world existed. It existed in the world, and  
 the world made itself through It, and the world did  
 11 not know It. He came to his own, and his own did  
 12 not receive Him. As many however as received Him,  
 He gave to them an existence to make themselves sons of  
 13 God, to those that<sup>d</sup> have truth in his Divinity; who

<sup>a</sup> Εγίνετο ἀνδρῶς πισταλμῖνος, *a man appeared after having been sent*. This verse, like other verses of this famous introduction of John, has been most miserably mangled. The translations present great inconsistencies and absurdities. By the general translators his verb *εγίνετο*, which occupies throughout the context such a high position, is in this verse degraded to a mere subordinate auxiliary to *πισταλμῖνος*, while too another tense than the perfect passive of *ἀποστέλλω* would have been more appropriate. But much more appropriate would it have been to have used a past tense of the verb *ἀποστέλλω* alone, which had this been the meaning John himself would most undoubtedly have employed. The translation is preposterous and absurd. It is this and such like monstrous translations of this holy Evangel that compels us to write a separate but short article on the style, intelligence, and disposition of John.

<sup>b</sup> Ἀλλ' ἵνα μαρτυρήσῃ περὶ τοῦ φωτός, *nevertheless it was his duty to testify of the Light*. It is a common and well-known bearing of *ἵνα*, coupled with verbs of the subjunctive aorists, to express *duty* or *obligation*. Hence that obvious and well-known expression of Epict, *Σωκράτης οὐκ ἵνα πάθῃ ταῦτα ὑπ' Ἀθηναίων*, that is, *Socrates OUGHT NOT TO HAVE SUFFERED these things from the Athenians*.

<sup>c</sup> Ἐρχομῖνος, *coming*. There is no article here. The meaning of the phrase is *entering into existence*, becoming a part of the material arrangements of the heavens. The word rendered ΦΩΣ, Light, is a neuter gender. It is necessary to retain this distinction in several of the expressions; but the difficulty of changing from the one to the other gender appears in our idiom.

<sup>d</sup> Τοῖς πιστεύουσιν ἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, the literal rendering is, *to the believers in his name*, or *to those that have truth or confidence in his name*. But the preposition *ΕΙΣ* is not necessary to be always rendered. In the word *NAME* however there is no meaning. What then does John mean by the

were born not of bloods, nor of a will of flesh, nor of a will of man, but of God : and the Word made itself a

introduction of so unmeaning a word here as ONOMA, NAME? Words without ideas are nothing. No, nor ever was it the intention of John to use in so conspicuous and important a position such a word without an idea, and an essentially important idea. The context *entirely depends* on the translation or meaning of this ONOMA, or NAME of God. What name? The name of יהוה. The real and proper root, name, or designation of God in almost all Eastern languages, such as the Syriac, Samaritan, Phynician, Egyptian, and Hebrew, eternally bore the signification of the EXISTENS; the LIVER; in a substantive or noun state, *life, existence*; in Latin phrase, ENS, coming from *esse*; in Greek, *ουσια*, life, nearly EX-ist-ence, from *ειναι*, living, or *in a state of life*; this from *ειμι*, *I live, exist, I am*, in this very sense, we mean of *life*. The verb is often used in John and the Greek scriptures. The *ια* attached to *ουσι-ια*, is the holy name or designation of *Ja*, or the *Exister, the One that lives*; in short, the *ου*, the *ου*, the *εχουμιους*, qualities which were also, as a matter of course, ascribed among the Greeks to *Ζeus*. After all the NAME יהוה means DIVINITY, summed up in EX-ISTENCE.

The Syriac, Chaldaic, Phynician, Hebrew, and other Eastern kindred dialects, form nouns on the principle of the affix *יה*, or *ia*. Take for example the common word *רשע*, now well known to us, add *יה* to it, *רשעיה*. It is now a peculiar noun, *wicked-ITY*, if we could use the expression—wicked, in a state of life or existence—impietas—cruelty—*rampant wickedness*. The same affix has been carried into the Western or European dialects, without however being well recognised. This life or living essential operation of God, or the NAME of God, constitutes his *regal* or *kingly ubiquity*, by which he reigns in and over all things through a portion of himself being thrown into or coming into the world of existences every where. The highest manifestations of the God in flesh appears in the highest intellectual and moral existences among men, called *here his own*. The יהוה in short among the Syrians, Hebrews, and ancient Greeks is the *ουσα* in which we are directed by the Evangelist to have practical living confidence or truth; which *ουσα* or NAME represents, without any sort of ambiguity, the *life or entity*, which is nearly synonymous with *existence*, the eternal living state of The, The God in man, who is able to FASHION or FORM you as you choose. The word *εξουσια*, which John uses in the text, rendered by the vulgar translators *power*, is almost the very same as EX-ist-ence. We have the *ES* or *EX* in both, then the *IST-ENCE* for *ουσι*. *ENCE* indeed or *ENS* is the very idea of which we are in quest, and which we have already seen. *Εξουσια, existence*. We have an *entity* or *ens* or *ence*, out of what?

flesh, and dwelt in us, and we have beheld ourselves  
Its glory, a glory as of an only begotten from [the]

The Exister; he who *lives*. There is no life or spirit of Life out of, or apart from, Him, or the meaning of his Name. With this explanation and the use of *existence* for *ἔστιν*, the word *name* might be retained. The whole of John proceeds on the meaning of this word. Hence too *ζῆν ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι*, may have *life* through his name [or *life*]. The same conclusion is obvious from the remarkable reply of Messiah, *Πρὶν Ἀβραάμ γενέσθαι, ἔγω εἰμι*, that is, Before Abraham appeared, I EXIST, I LIVE. God only is represented as acting and living in the Gospels. Before however leaving this extraordinary translation, it is justifiable to inform our readers, that in the Gospels and consequently in John, *onomas*, or *names*, are characteristic of the individuals or beings, which the names represent, such as Nathaniel, *נאθαν*, which means, *given to God* or *given by God*: the Hebrew is *בית עדה*: *Beth Esda*, *בית חסד* *house of mercy* or *benevolence*; Hebrew *בית חסד*, *Capernaum* *בית חסד*, *the denied resurrection*, to deny the resurrection; the Hebrew is *בית חסד*, having the same signification.

The verb *γενέσθαι* cannot in all cases be very precisely rendered into our tongue. It depends so much on the sense; but whatever be the dependance, we are in no case authorised to render a *Middle Voice*, *Passive*. God or the Word or Logos is not a *PASSIVE* but an *ACTIVE* agent. The *γενέσθαι* of the fifteenth verse might be translated made himself, but a creation or life in the form of good men. The same conclusion is obvious from the remarkable reply of the Messiah, *Πρὶν Ἀβραάμ γενέσθαι, ἔγω εἰμι*. The *γενέσθαι* of the sixth verse, rendered *appeared*, carries with it the idea of the coming of the following verse; it is partly explained by the *ἦλθ*. This mode or style of John appears in many places of his gospel, and in this very celebrated introduction. It might have been desirable to enter a little on the Syriac interpretation of the verb *πιστεύουσιν*, *having truth in the name*. The Hebrews talk of the Word under *מִימְרָא דֵּי*, *word of God*. This *דֵּי* exists among the Chaldeans as well as the hieroglyphic Egyptians for God.

Michaelis thinks that John wrote against Cerinthus: there does not however appear to be any reason whatever for this observation. The sources from which he draws at least some of his data for this conclusion are corrupt, and polluted in the highest degree. Better things on this topic might have been expected from Michaelis. John was evidently a Gnostic, from whom, however, it is not necessary to conclude that he borrowed, as Michaelis thinks, any terms, even though *Λόγος*, *Ζωή*, *Φῶς*, *Μονογενής*, *Πληρωμα*, are used by this religious philosophical section of mankind. The works of Cerinthus are either destroyed, or unknown, or misrepresented.





15 Father, full of grace and truth. John is a witness of  
 Him, and has cried, saying, this was he of whom I  
 16 spoke, he that comes after me has lived before me ; be-  
 cause he existed before me ; because of his fulness we  
 17 all have received, and grace for grace ; because the law  
 was given by Moses, grace and truth came through  
 Jesus Christ.


*Introductory to the consideration of the style, intelligence,  
 and spirit of the Evangelist John.*

“ His gospel abounds with repetitions, and repetitions are peculiar to, as *λογος και ο λογος* ; the frequent use of the pronoun *εγω*, where there is no emphasis, and therefore where it was unnecessary in the Greek language, *εγω υπαγω*. The writers of the New Testament have never pretended to the beauties of literary composition ; and St. Paul, who was the most able, has used in his Epistles the same expressions as he would have used in common conversation : *εξουσια*, 1 Cor. xi. 10.”—MICHAELIS.

“ It is just such a language as might be expected from the apostles, from persons of that age and in their situation. It is the style neither of classic authors nor of ancient fathers, but of Greek coming from men of Hebrew origin, abounding with Hebraic and Syriac idioms, such as would naturally

The polluted channels through which the truth has flowed to us must be carefully observed. The Light however shines in the darkness, though the darkness has tried to confound it.

The Syriac term  Word, has more frequently in the scriptures this very signification, Word, than any other idea. It represents also *cause*. In Math. the centurion says,  *say*,  *the word*. The Syriac term for *world*,  is comprehensive, *eternity, age or ages, youth, a boy or girl, the world*.

 The Word, or Logos, takes up its abode in us, in our flesh, in the appearance of sinful flesh. We are all—*intended to be*—Temples of God, the Word or Logos. The perfect man in Christ is a perfect Temple. Some are very miserable and deformed looking buildings, in consequence however of opposition to the Light, in consequence of their vices and those of their progenitors. We are dissatisfied when we contemplate ourselves narrowly. Little either of grace, intelligence or truth, shines forth from the face and head of the fleshly Temple Man !



found in the writings of men who used a language, spoken indeed where they lived, but not the common dialect of the country."—PALEY.

"Joannes autem simplicilatēque piscatoris humilitasque verborum per suam majestatem atque sublimitatem abunde compensatur."—WETSTEIN.

"Τούτων τῶν ἀποστόλων αἱ ἀνθρώπιναι δυνάμεις παρίστηκαν ἐκπληττομένηαι τοῖς πολλοῖς τοῦ πνεύματος καὶ τῆς σοφίας, καὶ τὴν ὥρην τῆς ἀρετῆς δι' ἣς καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐπίσταντο τὸν Χριστὸν καὶ τὴν πνευματικὴν ὑληθῆ χάριν. Οἱ οὖν οὐκ εἰσι τοῦ αἵματος, ἰδοὺ τοῦ υἱοῦ Ζηβεδαιοῦ, ἀλλὰ τοῦ τε βαθέος τοῦ Θεοῦ ὕδατος, τοῦ πνεύματος λίγων· αὐτοὶ ἀναπνεύσαντες τὴν λυγρὴν οὐρανὴν ἀκούομεν."—CHRYSOSTOM.

"The apostles were mere children in bookmaking."—DR. CHALMER'S LECTURES ON PALEY.\*

It is remarkable how much knowledge acquired, intuitive or revealed, modifies and changes the characters of things. The same object beheld by different men appears altogether different. The fault, of course, lies not so much in the objects themselves, as in the beholders. Hence, for example, the men commissioned of old to view the promised land gave a frightful representation, which others considered delightful and charming. Preconceived and false notions, derived as much from education as personal incapacity, have entirely changed the face and nature of the gospels. The authors themselves, as a matter of course, must share the obloquy which ever attends a false representation. In the midst however of the many books that challenge the attention of mankind, the four gospels stand alone. Though distinct and separate, they all, like four rivers bending their way to the ocean, take one direction, which is incapable of being misunderstood. Like separate rivers however they may differ in their lengths, breadths, depths, windings, or velocities, but they never differ in their course or forget their destinations. They all move on it may be, forgive the expression, apparently simply, oftener thoughtfully and judiciously, sometimes very sorrowfully, oftener nobly and majestically, in their course. Their banks, like the Clyde or the Thames, the Euphrates

---

\* This I quote from memory.

or the Danube, may be more or less diversified or picturesque, but their channels abound with the waters of life, of which if a man drink he shall even live for ever. But laying aside all metaphor, we maintain that it will be found, on a close and critical inspection and understanding of the gospels, that the endless differences, with which reputed infidels have justly but ignorantly reproached reputed Christians, are not real but apparent; that they are the consequences of an atheistical and literary ignorance, which it is our duty, be the consequences what they may, to endeavour to sweep away; that in short the vulgar miracles themselves, so boastingly and ignorantly held up and appealed to by the reputed false friends of the Messiah of God for the truth of their system, though really and essentially descriptive of the object of the narrators, are, after fifteen hundred years of eternal quarrelling, holy figurative and parabolic truths; that moreover, instead of an individual *personally* perambulating the length and breadth of Palestine, according to the conceptions of the false churches of Christendom, it is a personification of the God, who in all ages and countries has been and still is, here admired, loved, feared, worshipped—there hooted, mocked, stoned, condemned under the semblance of law and justice, and finally crucified by the selfish, cunning, voracious animal nature of Adam, which in itself is only evil, and that continually! However before proceeding farther, we warn the following characters in the words of Chrysostom, to abandon their inferior actions before they sit in judgment on this Holy Gospel. Οὕτω δὲ καὶ οὗτοι γελῶντες, τρυφῶντες, καὶ πλουτῶ, καὶ δυναστεία, καὶ τῇ γαστρὶ ζῶντες, ἀκούουσι μὲν εἰς τὸ ὅτι τῶν εἰρημενόν, μέγα δὲ οὐδὲν οὐδὲ ὑψηλὸν ἐπὶ τῶν ἐργῶν ἐνδείκνυνται, τῷ καθαπαξ τῇ πλινθίᾳ καὶ τῷ πηλῷ προσηλουν ἑαυτοὺς.

The authors placed at the top, though they vary considerably in their qualities and personal excellencies, are there presented not because they are equal, but because

they have all given a verdict on the subject of the gospels. Paley and Dr. Chalmers, who are known as champions of the vulgar false Messiah, have no claim on us purely as learned men, for they have written nothing which, strictly speaking, entitles them to this designation. Their assertions, therefore, in reference to the authenticity of the Greek of the Evangelists or Paul, on both of which the former has come forward and given much legality and currency to a coin very inferior and base indeed, are not sufficient authorities on the subject. To the assertion then of Paley, that Corinthians, either first or second, is the style of Paul, on which he comes forward in his *Horæ Paulinæ*, we give the boldest contradiction: that instead of being Paul's, these epistles are an obvious and vile forgery, composed and placed designedly under the name of Paul for unjust, unholy purposes. They of course, however, contain expressions and passages of this great apostle, but this has nothing to do with the epistles as a whole. Michaelis, one of the best of modern scholars, has fallen into the same error, and attributed to Paul by adopting Corinthians, a style, language, and sentiments, often disgraceful. Before however this man arose, one age after another has *more or less* trumpeted the same tale, after however having destroyed the writings of the first ages, and put to death the best of men. O the knavery and selfishness of the blind animal Adam! It is not however necessary that we should listen, as Jerome remarks, to the deadly songs of the mermaids as we pass their caves!

There are many writers moreover of considerable common place literature, whom we might have named, that reflect, and justly, if we allow such to form a judgment of a subject which they have neither investigated, nor are capable of investigating, nor understood, in no measured terms on the style of John, for what they are pleased to call *his*, but in reality *their* anachronisms; in other words, for the expression of his ideas in erroneous Greek tenses,

as if he really misunderstood what he was writing ; as if he were ignorant of the distinction between the past and present tenses, between the active, middle, and passive voices of the Greek language. *ὦ μοι ἐγών !* In opposition however to all this phalanx of European and Christian literature, long taken as it may be for granted, and comparatively hallowed by time, we raise our voice, the first we believe in Christendom to do so, and bluntly deny, in opposition to Michaelis or any other learned man, that John is either egotistical in reference to the Messiahship of God, of which he speaks, and in whose name or divinity he promulgates his eternal truths ; or that he, out upon it ye ignorant, knew not the distinction between the tenses, the moods, and voices of the Greek verbs, for this is really the consequence to which your translations lead : but instead of this, it is you, false friends, who misunderstanding his ideas, will not come to the Light ; who, from erroneous premises, rather no premises at all, draw the unfounded conclusions which we stigmatize as the offscourings of all things ; you, who having lit up a taper of your own fabrication, walk on from generation to generation, consequentially indeed, but stumbling and staggering like drunken men from stone to hillock, under the influence of your selfish erroneous lights ; you, on whom we cast the onus of all the darkness and horrid misunderstandings, which have set the whole world at war with itself, husband with wife, father with son, sect with sect, nation with nation ; it is you, who have caused little shabby fellows deformed in body and in mind, working out the darkness within them to lift up their discordant voices, and their unhallowed hands to desecrate and upset what they choose to call Christianity altogether, as if the whole were the fabrication of money-making priests, actually more venal, if we believe them, than the crowd everywhere are, and more disposed to follow Christ for the loaves and the fishes than they themselves. It belongs however to you, civilian, mechanic,

socialist, editor or philosopher, or whatever else you term yourself, uncontrolled by the sin of money, to cast the first stone at the clergy and the church, within whose pale you yourselves, we are convinced, would not act one whit more disinterestedly. However, we maintain in common with Michaelis, that there are many Hebraic and Syriac terms and expressions in the gospel of great beauty and utility, but we also maintain in opposition to him that the Greek is much better than has yet been admitted or understood; that John possessed greater talents, understanding, and even benevolence, than the very false Christians themselves and their learned men have ever admitted; that after all disputations about his Greek are at an end, his very gospel, holy and extraordinary as it is considered, and ever will be so, is a kind of drama; a composition which requires even in a common way other and more varied talents, than those of a mere narrator of a common perambulating living biography; all which propositions, whether we enter into them or not at present, we are fully prepared and bound to maintain.

First then, we deny the anachronisms imputed to John, and as a consequence we insist upon the following tenses of the Greek verbs being translated into our language.

*Present Tenses of Greek Verbs rendered into our vulgar version Past.*

Chap. ver.

I. 15, Ματυρει,	bears witness,	rend.	bare witness.
— 39, Μενει,	dwells,	—	dwelt.
— 50, Λεγει,	says,	—	said.
II. 9, Ποθεν εστι,	whence it is,	—	whence it was.
— — Φονει,	calls,	—	called.
— 16, Πωλουσιν,	that sell,	—	sold.
— 24, Γινωσκειν,	knows,	—	knew.
IV. 1, Ποιει και βαπτιζει,	makes	—	made and bap-
	and baptizes,		tized.
VI. 12, Λεγει,	says,	—	said.

Chap. ver.

VI. 24,	Ουκ εστι, not exist,	<i>rend.</i> was not.
VII. 6,	Λεγει, says,	— said.
XI. 6,	Ασθενει, is sick,	— was sick.
— 20,	Ιησους ερχεται, Jesus comes,	— was coming.
— 29,	Εργεται, comes,	— came.
— 57,	Που εστι, where he is,	— where he were.
XII. 9,	Εκει εστι, he exists there,	— he was.
XV. 27,	Εστε, you are,	— you have been.
XVIII. 28,	Αγουσιν, they lead,	— they led.

*Present Tenses rendered Future.*

v. 24,	Ερχομαι, comes,	<i>rend.</i> shall come.
vi. 14,	Ερχομενον, comes,	— should come.
vii. 42,	Ερχεται, comes,	— shall come.
xiv. 3,	Παλιν ερχομαι, I come again,	— I will come again.

There are other aberrations of the same sort not mentioned here.

Would any one believe that this is the state of our translation of the Gospel of John, alike applicable, with one or two exceptions, to the Protestant and Doway translations? We assert, moreover, that these translations are essential to the very existence of the Gospel of John, and to the Messiahship of God, on which the gospel is founded.

The next course incumbent on us to pursue, is the exhibition of the proofs in confirmation of the truth that John knew well the distinction between the present, past, and future tenses of these very verbs, which our versions have misrepresented. The very same falsehoods, for they can be called by no other name, have even been carried into the Latin translations. In the case, for example, of the fourteenth chapter, where *παλιν ερχομαι* occurs, we have the future, *redibo*, a state of things common to the Protestant and Roman versions. But the false Messiah is obliged to be supported by falsehood. The proof how-

ever that John knew well the verbs, and the ideas attached to them, may be taken for granted. When our position is denied we shall be happy to come forward, and in a manner too not exhibited in this work.

However, for illustration of this part of the subject, you had better consider that the verb *Μενει* of the first chapter, rendered *dwelt*, embraces in the grand and noble ideas of John the eternal Messiahship, unconfined to a Judaical locality, to which the ignorant in their translations have limited him; that the Messiah abides or dwells for ever in a locality, which the false Christians and the blind do not understand.

Further on the subject of egotistical or unemphatical Greek pronouns, for which John has been condemned, let us take one or two passages for examination of his style. Suppose we take the conversation between the Messiah and the woman of Samaria.

### *The Messiah and the Woman of Samaria.*

Ερχεται γυνη εκ της Σαμαρειας, αντλησαι υδωρ· λεγει αυτη ο Ιησους· Δος μοι πειν. Οι γαρ μαθηται αυτου απηλθυθεισαν εις την πολιν, ινα τροφας αγορασωσι. Λεγει ουν αυτω η γυνη η Σαμαρειτις· πως ΣΥ, Ιουδαιος ων, παρ' εμου πειν αιτεις, ουσης γυναικος Σαμαρειτιδος; ου γαρ συγχρωνται Ιουδαιοι Σαμαρειταις. Απεκριθη Ιησους και ειπεν αυτη· ει ηδεις την δωρεαν του Θεου, και τις εστιν ο λεγων σοι· δος μοι πειν· ΣΥ αν ητησας αυτον, και εδωκεν αν σοι υδωρ ζων. Λεγει αυτω η γυνη· κυριε, ουτε αντλημα εχεις, και το φρεαρ εστι βαθυ· ποθεν ουν εχεις το υδωρ το ζων; μη ΣΥ μειζων ει του πατρος ημων Ιακωβ, ος εδωκεν ημιν το φρεαρ, και αυτος εξ αυτου επιε, και οι υιοι αυτου, και τα θρεμματα αυτου; Απεκριθη Ιησους και ειπεν αυτη· πας ο πινων εκ του υδατος τουτου, διψησει παλιν· ος δ' αν πιη εκ του υδατος, ου ΕΓΩ δωσω αυτω, ου μη διψηση εις τον αιωνα· αλλα το υδωρ, ο δωσω αυτω, γενησεται εν αυτω πηγη υδατος αλλομενου εις ζωνην αιωνιον.

“A woman of Samaria comes to draw water. Jesus says to her, Give me to drink : for his disciples had gone into the city to buy food. The woman of Samaria says to him, How is it that  $\tau\eta\upsilon$ , *though a Jew*, dost ask [water] to drink of me, *though a woman* of Samaria : for the Jews have no correspondence with the Samaritans? Jesus answered and said to her, If thou hadst known the gift of God, and who he is that says to thee, give me [water] to drink,  $\tau\eta\upsilon$  wouldst perhaps have asked him and he would have given thee living water. The woman says to him, Sir, thou hast not even a *pitcher*, and the well is deep, whence then hast thou this living water. Art  $\tau\eta\upsilon$  greater than our father Jacob, who gave us the well, and drank of it himself, and his children and his cattle? Jesus answered and said to her, Every one that drinks of this water shall thirst again ; but whosoever drinks of the water that *I* will give him, shall never thirst : yea the water that I will give him shall become in him a well of water springing up to everlasting life.”

In this passage there are four Greek nominative pronouns, three of the second person  $\Sigma\Upsilon$ , and one of  $\text{ΕΓΩ}$ , which are marked in the translation by capitals. It requires, however, very little penetration to perceive that every one of them is emphatic in a high degree. Here let us remark is the Messiah represented fatigued with his journey, sitting on the well of Jacob, and asking water from a Samaritan, a people with whom the Jews had no correspondence. Surprised at a question from such a quarter, the woman, instead of alluding to the request of the stranger, very properly asks, how is it that  $\Sigma\upsilon$ , *thou*,  $\text{Ιουδαίος ὢν}$ , *though a Jew*,  $\text{παρ' ἐμοῦ πίνει αἰτεῖς, οὐσης γυναῖκος Σαμαρείτιδος}$ , dost ask [water] to drink of me, *though a woman* of Samaria. Nothing can be more satisfactory as to the propriety of this emphatic pronoun. The second,  $\Sigma\upsilon \alpha\nu \piρσας αὐτον$ , that is,  $\tau\eta\upsilon$ , *though a woman* of Samaria, would perhaps have asked him, understood. The third pronoun,



Συ, is very emphatic. Somewhat confounded with the consequence of the stranger, the woman falls back immediately on the comparison of his importance and consequence with that of the founder of the well on which he sat, at once puts the common question, Συ μείζιον ει, Art τῆου, *then* greater than our father Jacob, who gave us the well? The first person, Εγω, which is the fourth example, may be considered as called for on the ground of the presentation of the contrast introduced by the woman between Jacob and the Messiah. Very considerable penetration and intelligence, be it also remarked, are displayed here by the introduction of the Messiah sitting on the well, and identified as the personification of the water of life. The italic type point out other parts of the passage as the true meaning of the Greek, and good Greek it is, of the Evangelist, which however is not understood, and consequently not translated either by the Doway or the Protestant versions. *Though a Jew*, and *though a woman* of Samaria are considerably different, apart altogether from the greater delicacy of thought and the superior elegance of language, which the translation implies. Besides all this, Αντλημα, a *pitcher*, to say the least of it, is not masterly rendered by the verbose, clumsy expression, *nothing to draw with*.

Take, however, another example for the illustration of this Greek of John, on the subject of unemphatic Greek pronouns.

### *The Blind Man and the Pharisees.*

Πηλον επεθηκεν επι τους οφθαλμους μου, και ενιψαμην, και βλεπω. Ελεγον ουν εκ των Φαρισαιων τινες· ουτος ο ανθρωπος ουκ εστι παρα του Θεου, οτι το σαββατον ου τηρει. Αλλοι ελεγον· πως δυναται ανθρωπος αμαρτωλος τοιαυτα σημεια ποιειν; και σχισμα ην εν αυτοις. Λεγουσι τω τυφλω παλιν· ΞΥ τι λεγεις περι αυτου, οτι ηνοιξε σου τους οφθαλμους; ο δε ειπεν· οτι προφητης εστιν. Ουκ επιστευσαν ουν οι Ιουδαιοι περι αυτου, οτι τυφλος ην, και

ανεβλεψεν, εως οτου εφωνησαν τους γονεις αυτου του αναβλεψαντος. Και ηρωτησαν αυτους, λεγοντες· ουτος εστιν ο υιος υμων, ον υμεις λεγετε, οτι τυφλος εγεννηθη; πως ουν αρτι βλεπει; απεκριθησαν αυτοις οι γονεις αυτου και ειπον· οίδαμεν, οτι ουτος εστιν ο υιος ημων, και οτι τυφλος εγεννηθη· πως δε νυν βλεπει, ουκ οίδαμεν· η τις ηνοιξεν αυτου τους οφθαλμους, ημεις ουκ οίδαμεν· αυτος ηλικιαν εχει, αυτον ερωτησατε· αυτος περι αυτου λαλησει. Ταυτα ειπον οι γονεις αυτου, οτι εφοβουντο τους Ιουδαιους· ηδη γαρ συνετεθειντο οι Ιουδαιοι, ινα εαν τις αυτον ομολογησιν Χριστον, αποσυναγωγος γενηται. Δια τουτο οι γονεις αυτου ειπον· οτι ηλικιαν εχει, αυτον ερωτησατε. Εφωνησαν ουν εκ δευτερου τον ανθρωπον, ος ην τυφλος, και ειπον αυτω· δος δοξαν τω Θεω· ημεις οίδαμεν, οτι ο ανθρωπος ουτος αμαρτωλος εστιν. Απεκριθη ουν εκεινος και ειπεν· ει αμαρτωλος εστιν, ουκ οίδα· εν οίδα, οτι, τυφλος ων, αρτι βλεπω. Ειπον δε αυτω παλιν· τι εποιησε σοι; πως ηνοιξε σου τους οφθαλμους; απεκριθη αυτοις· ειπον υμιν ηδη, και ουκ ηκουσατε· τι παλιν θελετε ακουειν; μη και υμεις θελετε αυτου μαθηται γενεσθαι; ελοιδορησαν αυτον, και ειπον· ΣΥ ει μαθητης εκεινου· ημεις δε του Μωσεως εσμεν μαθηται.

“ He put clay on my eyes, and I washed *myself*, and do see. Some of the Pharisees then said, This man is not of God, because he does not keep the sabbath. Others said, How can a man, a sinner, do such miracles? And there was a division among them. They say again to the blind man, What dost thou say of him, seeing he hath opened your eyes? He however said, That he is a prophet. The Jews did not believe him, that he was blind and recovered sight, till they called the parents of him who recovered sight. And they asked him, saying, Is this your son, of whom you say, that he was born blind? How then does he *yet* see? His parents answered them and said, We know that this is our son, and that he was born blind; but how he now sees, we know not, or who has opened his eyes, we do not know. He is of age, ask him; he will

speak for himself. His parents said these words, because they feared the Jews, for the Jews had already been agreed, that if any confess him [to be] Messiah he would be excommunicated. His parents therefore said that he is of age, ask him. They then called a second time the man who *was* blind, and said to him, Give God glory, we do know ourselves that this very man is a sinner. He then answered and said, If he is a sinner, I do not know [it]. One thing I do know, that *though blind, yet I see*. They said however again to him, What did he to thee? How did he open your eyes? He answered them, I told you already, and you did not hear; why do you wish again to hear? Do you also wish to make yourselves his disciples? They reviled him and said, *Thou* art his disciple, but we are Moses' disciples."

In this highly interesting and intelligent conversation, where the ever conflicting parties, *the bad and the good*, on a subject of great notoriety are strongly contrasted and confronted, there are seven Greek emphatic pronouns, *Συ, Υμεῖς, Ημεῖς, Ημεῖς, Υμεῖς, Συ, Ημεῖς*, every one of which bears pointedly on the nature of emphasis. It matters not which of them you contemplate, whether the *ημεῖς οἴδαμεν*, *we know ourselves that this man is a sinner*, opposed to the *ημεῖς*, *we* of the parents, or the only understood *εγω*, *of the blind man*, for he is nothing without the Messiah living within him; or, the *Συ*, *thou*, of the last sentence contrasted with the *Ημεῖς*, *we*, the *disciples of Moses*. But independent of this literary topic, highly interesting to all who view things in a proper light, or who are friendly to literature, which in a mercantile country can scarcely be expected, there are other topics of essential importance which cannot be passed over unnoticed. Nevertheless we have done here nothing, but what was our duty to do, kept to the Greek and the text. Not so the vulgar and even Latin translations, of whose excellence we every where hear so much from uninformed, ignorant people. Here the vulgar

translations are essentially opposed to the sentiments of the author and his everlasting Messiahship of God in man, expressed in good straightforward Greek, in connection with the parabolic, moral and mental blindness, for which explicit translations John has introduced the whole affair. The man was blind in the estimation of the Pharisees, *yet* he saw. The bad every where pretend that the good are blind and fools, though they themselves, even on their own showing, are the blind, and the only fools. *Yet* is one of the significations of *αρτι*. Hence, *ου δυνασθε βασταζειν αρτι*, you are not able to bear them *yet*.<sup>a</sup> Our false versions give us for *τυφλος ων*, *though blind—whereas I was blind*. This is a horrid misrepresentation of John's classic Greek expression, *τυφλος ων*; a classic Greek expression, which he repeatedly uses in his gospel, in every one of which they have mistranslated, and consequently misrepresented him; yet they call this the word of truth! *Ω μοι εγων!* It may perhaps be as well here to give the falsehoods of the different translations belonging to this Greek phrase existing in the gospel of John, since we have by the way alluded to the subject. *Ελεγε δε τον Ιουδαν Σιμωνος Ισκαριωτην, ουτος γαρ ημελλεν αυτον παραδιδουαι, ΕΙΣ ΩΝ εκ των δωδεκα*, He spake however of Judas Iscariot, [the son] of Simon, for this would betray him, *THOUGH ONE* of the twelve. Our version says, *BEING ONE* of the twelve. The Doway Roman version, *whereas he was one* of the twelve, a miserable translation of a good straightforward Greek expression.<sup>b</sup> *Λεγει Νικοδημος προς αυτους, ο ελθων νυκτος προς αυτον, ΕΙΣ ΩΝ εξ αυτων,*<sup>c</sup> Nicodemus, who came by night to him, says to them, *though one* of them. *Περι καλου εργου ου λιθαζομεν σε, αλλα περι βλασφημιας, και οτι συ, ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΣ ΩΝ, ποιεις σεαυτον Θεον*, For a good work we do not stone thee, but for blasphemy, *even* because thou, *THOUGH A MAN*, makest

<sup>a</sup> John, xvi. 12.<sup>b</sup> vi. 71.<sup>c</sup> vii. 50.

thyself God.<sup>a</sup> The vulgar version is, *and because thou being a man*. John, too, here uses delicately *και, even, και οτι συ, even because thou*. This very phrase is, as we have said, peculiarly Grecian, a phrase to which we have already in Galatians adverted. Hence the following verse of Euripides, where the very same words exist :

Ως μὲν λεγουσιν, οτι θεοις, ανθρωπος ων,

Speaking of Tantalus, who, *though a man*,

Κοινῆς τραπέζης αξιωμ' εχων ισον.

Farther, on the same classic Greek phrase repeatedly used by John, we have : ΕΙΣ ΔΕ ΤΙΣ ΕΞ ΑΥΤΩΝ, ΚΑΙΑΦΑΣ, ΑΡΧΙΕΡΕΥΣ ΩΝ ΤΟΥ ΕΝΙΑΥΤΟΥ ΕΚΕΙΝΟΥ, ΕΙΠΕΝ ΑΥΤΟΙΣ, A certain one however of them, Caiaphas, THOUGH HIGH PRIEST of that year, said to them.<sup>b</sup> ΛΕΓΕΙ ΕΙΣ ΕΚ ΤΩΝ ΔΟΥΛΩΝ ΤΟΥ ΑΡΧΙΕΡΕΩΣ, ΣΥΓΓΕΝΗΣ ΩΝ, ΟΥ ΑΠΕΚΟΨΕ ΠΕΤΡΟΣ ΤΟ ΩΤΙΟΝ, One of the servants of the high priest, THOUGH A RELATION, whose ear Peter cut off.<sup>c</sup> The last we shall give on this part of the literary and moral character of John, for the phrase sanctions considerable delicacy of moral thought, is Μετα δε ταυτα ηρωτησε τον Πιλατον ο Ιωσηφ ο απο Αριμαθαιας, ΩΝ Μαθητης, του Ιησου, κεκρυμμενος δε δια τον φοβον των Ιουδαιων, After these things, however, Joseph of Arimathea, THOUGH A DISCIPLE of Jesus, but concealed through fear of the Jews, asked Pilate.<sup>d</sup>

We have now done with this phrase, which of itself however places John in a different position from that in which he has ever stood, at least with the moderned learned men of Christendom ; a phrase which may tend to open the eyes of some, who though they think they see distinctly, are nevertheless blind. We now therefore return from this bye-path to the highway of our course, the consideration of the unemphatic Greek pronouns. The passages already

<sup>a</sup> John, x. 33.

<sup>b</sup> xi. 49.

<sup>c</sup> xviii. 26.

<sup>d</sup> xix. 38.

reviewed, though distinct and appropriate, lie more in the common route than the one to which we shall immediately advert. When the Messiah is introduced personally addressing his disciples, or even the Jews, a new scene of things appears. John no longer considers the Greek verb with all its characteristic, definite, and unambiguous terminations, sufficient to display the marked character and all-engrossing importance of this great personage; without whom, all he sees and feels is darkness and destruction in man; all but the effervescence of a spirit and existence which is death, and which, gratified and pampered and cajoled as it may be, leads only to death. It is not at all therefore wonderful that he, with such a sight before him, with such a conviction of the state and prospects of the animal man, considers pronouns and verbs, and every adjunct and metaphor of language, all too little to express the dignity and nobility of the character. What! John egotistical here, even with all the aid of pronouns which any language can give! Out upon it, ye learned of Christendom! Εγώ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ζῶν, ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβὰς, εἰν τις φάγη ἐκ τούτου τοῦ ἁρτου, ζήσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα; καὶ ὁ ἄρτος δε, ὃν ἐγὼ δώσω, ἡ σαρκὶς μου ἐστίν, ἣν ἐγὼ δώσω ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς;<sup>a</sup> *I am the living bread, which came down from Heaven; if any eat of this bread, he shall live for ever; and the bread, indeed, which I will give, is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world.* Here we harmonize perfectly with John in the full extent of his Greek emphatic pronoun, ἐγώ, applied as it is to the God made flesh, and its essential divinity in and over all the operations of the universe. Its grand prominence here then, how distinct soever and striking, appears highly commendable. *I*, or ἐγώ, the re-

---

<sup>a</sup> John, vi. 51. The word καταβὰς; is the second aorist part, and therefore not translated by CAME DOWN. It conveys a PAST and a PRESENT, COMING DOWNS. There is no suitable expression in our language.

presentative of the great personage, is, beautiful as the simile may be, more than the shadow of a great rock in a weary land; it is, indeed, life from the dead in the midst of the dry, selfish, blind, conceited deserts of animalism under the reign of radical, social, and Christian atheism. The passage before us, is, moreover, one about which false Christian sects have been long contending. The language however is explicit, and requires no explanation to prove its meaning and obvious tendency. Mankind, in all ages, have ever associated with the eating of flesh and the drinking of blood, the horrible.\* The Jews themselves strikingly manifest the same feeling at the bare enunciation of the words. For a rough and rude representation however of the passage, you may consider the existence of man composed of two natures; the one, crawling, cunning, earthly, selfish, destructive; the other, noble, wise, disinterested, heavenly, divine, carrying in its form and front the elements of the Divinity, and displaying in its air and gesture the manifestations of the God. Each however appears to have a material, through which it works and sends forth its infinitely varied effects. Living in the former, you go on to death; in the latter, to life. From the one, you receive misery, wrinkles, deformity, war, bloodshed and murder, and every noxious inhalation; from the other, peace, happiness, beauty, life, preservation, immortality, and even manifestations of a higher order of things. The union however of the two in one existence, whether viewed in a material or spiritual capacity, is dark and deep. Hence you will perceive that mankind, with the greatest propriety in

---

\* Dr. Wiseman, of the Roman section of Christians, has reasoned properly on the meaning of the words in his *Lectures on Transubstantiation*; but by applying them to a mysterious eating of bread and wine, as the real body and blood of the ever living divinity, he has drawn a horrid and monstrous conclusion, of which he ought to be ashamed. In his remarks to Dr. Lee, of Cambridge, he shows the cloven foot. Truth is not altogether his element.

the world, may be said to have *no life*, as it is expressed in the Greek, ἐν ταυτοῖς, in themselves. Life therefore it must have from some other quarter than itself, be the consequence what it will, even though it actually prey upon the other godlike nature for existence.

#### REPETITIONS OF JOHN.

Another charge against John is repetitions, of which the beginning of his gospel, In eternity was *the Word* and *the Word* was with God, is given as a specimen. This, whether true or false, coming as it does from Michaelis, and coupled as it is with some of the evangelist's best ideas, deserves attention. It is such conduct as this however that often calls forth investigation, and leads to greater reflection and the best results. Truth is never ashamed; and John, we are convinced, would be the first to second the proposition. It is falsehood and knavery only that skulk in the dark, and strive to hide their ugly forms and deceitful faces. Let us however bear in mind, that while almost every individual of this age is endeavouring to raise *himself*, the author of this gospel shrinks humbly behind the scenes, and holds up the Light for the contemplation and admiration of mankind. However, repetitions can be sanctioned only on the following grounds, the goodness of the language and the importance and nobility of the ideas.

It is a common practice among the young everywhere, when any thought of moment strikes them forcibly, to repeat the same corresponding word or sign. Instead of changing the expression in giving renewed vent to the ideas, they instantly fall back upon the same ground, somewhat modified it may be, but in all respects similar, often indeed without the change of a single letter. Ask the child why it does so, or condemn it for doing so, it may perhaps look upon you with surprise, or turn upon you with something resembling the feeling of the Indian when lectured by his civilised brother on the existence of a God, and ask you,



Do you think I am a fool? The sense and propriety and even beauty of this course is every reason, and above all reasons. Even the ancients themselves, and the Greeks, the most fastidious and delicate of the ancients, were prone to the repetition of fine passages and noble sentiments. Instead of throwing the same ideas into a different garb, as the straining moderns are eternally doing with the most trifling ones, they gloried in presenting them without the least modification, unaltered.

The beginning however of almost all things is often characteristic of the middle and the end. Even in the calm that precedes a tempest, the discerning few can read the coming storm. There is indeed something accompanying the nature of all things, which nothing can disguise. In the first stone of a building, you can trace the size and quality of the house. In the first look and gesture of a man, you may distinguish his birth and quality, though his dress, the key to the multitude, deceives you. The first sentence of a story, book or speech, often tells a tale and casts its shadow before, even though nothing very striking attends it. Moreover, the best and noblest ideas may be clothed, like great men, in humble attire. In the sentence, *God said, let there be light, and there was light*, there is no meretricious ornament, nothing to amuse or catch the vulgar eye, yet its greatness is undoubted. The infinite no sooner said than done, constitutes the beauty and charm of the whole; there is nothing laboured or labouring; all easy, natural, and commanding. You look for this and it is so; nor could any other arrangement of the words, or straining at effect, produce the same result. *God said, let there be light, which immediately happened*, might take with the ignorant, but would be condemned by the learned. True, the humble conjunction *and* would be discarded, but no one could be found to supply its place. The same writer of this noble sentence wrote also, *In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth; and the earth was without form*

*and void.*<sup>a</sup> Here however it will be remarked, that a close analogy exists between the beginning of John and the beginning of Genesis. *In eternity was the Word and the Word was with God, and God,* is in some respects very nearly related. It is at once wise, just, and good, to name these things, not only because they fall not within the range of the multitude, or the low notions of a selfish mercantile people, but because without this course justice cannot be done the subject.

#### BEGINNING OF JEREMIAH.

Jeremiah begins his book with the fore-knowledge of God, כִּסְרִי אֶצְוֹרֶךְ. כִּנְנִן יִתְעַתֵּךְ וּבִטְרִי תִצַּח מִרֶחֶם חֲקִרְשִׁיךְ, which the vulgar version renders, Before I formed thee in the belly, I knew thee; and before thou camest forth from the womb, I sanctified thee. The words כִּנְנִן, רֶחֶם, belly, and womb, are nearly synonymous in their ideas. The root signification of רֶחֶם, however, is *mercy*, or love. Though the prophet changes the words, he may modify, but he does not change the idea. The subject in his estimation is highly important. It deserves, and receives, as it ought, a higher place in the natural arrangements of things.

#### ISAIAH.

Isaiah, a prophet more noble than Jeremiah, overcome with the sight of the ungrateful and monstrous conduct of mankind, standing as he saw and felt they did to God in the relation of children to a father, instead of addressing them, the objects of his solicitude, he breaks out in the most just and impassioned strain, and addresses the inanimate creation of the heavens and the earth. שִׁמְעֵי שָׁמַיִם, וְהֶאָרֶץ, Hear, O Heavens, and give ear, O earth! for the Lord has spoken; I have nourished and brought up chil-

---

<sup>a</sup> It is not necessary for our present purpose to enter into any proposed alterations of this translation of the beginning of Genesis.

dren, and they have rebelled against me. *וַיָּדַע ה' אֶת הָעֹלָם*, the ox *knows* his owner, and the ass his master's crib. *וְיִשְׂרָאֵל לֹא יָדָע*, *Israel* does not *know*; *my people* do not consider. *וְיִשְׂרָאֵל*, *Israel*, *וְיִשְׂרָאֵל*, *my people*, is a change of words, but little change of sentiment, even though *יָדָע* signifies *Just* or *right* God. There must be, in short, repetitions of one kind or another, when such conceptions exist. It is the same state of mind that occasions a repetition of a different sort, where one comparison follows another in rapid succession; thus, the daughter of Sion is left *like a cottage* in a vineyard, *like a lodge* in a garden of cucumbers, *like a besieged city*.

### HOMER.

Homer, in the introduction of his celebrated poem, begins very much like Isaiah, and enters at once into the heart of the evil; into the middle and causes of the whole subject, about which he is going to write.

Μηνιν αειδε, Θεα, Πηληιαδεω Αχιλλους  
Ουλομενην η μυρι' Αχαιοις αλγε' εθηκε.

*Μηνιν*, *rage* or *wrath*, or a kindred idea, is the first word of his books. Sing, O goddess, the destructive wrath of Achilles. The course, however, is highly commendable.

### MILTON.

Our Milton takes the very same course as the men before us, by entering into the cause of his poem, the fall of Adam:

Of man's *first* disobedience, and *the fruit*  
Of that forbidden tree....sing heavenly Muse.

### THOMSON.

Thomson, a poet and a man, who deserves from the modern readers of goodness, intelligence, and poetry, much greater attention than he has yet received, breaks out in his

manly, godlike strain, in an address to the great spirit and subject of his poem :

Come, gentle *Spring*, *etherial mildness*, come !

*Spring* and *etherial mildness* are very nearly related.

#### TASSO.

Tasso, whose subject very much resembles Virgil, whom at the commencement he has closely followed, presents little variation :

Canto l' arme pietose e 'l Capitano  
Che 'l gran Sepulcro libero di Cristo.

#### DANTE.

Dante, however, varies a little in his course from these men, but follows them in a different way. He begins, like Genesis and John, with the preposition *in*. *In the middle* of the path of our life, thus :

Nel mezzo del camin di nostra vita  
Mi ritrovai per una selva oscura.

Isaiah says, *In dimidio dierum meorum, vadam ad portas inferi*, which Dante resembles.

#### SHAKSPEARE.

All the world's a stage.

*To be or not to be*, that is the question.

Are lines that announce something, and cast their shadows before.

..... These are actors  
As I foretold you, were all spirits, and  
Are melted *into air*, *into thin air*.

Mahomet and his Koran composers take the hint, and repeat justly, *God is God*.

This subject requires much knowledge of these things. It is therefore proper that we should present something for the consideration of the mind. It may however be observed, that under certain circumstances, a repetition not

merely of the ideas, but of the very words, may be not only barely sanctionable, but even justifiable and commendable. John, we agree with Michaelis, does repeat. Are his repetitions then, at the commencement and in other parts of his gospel, of a justifiable nature? *Εν αρχη*, he says, *ην ο λογος*, which he repeats in the second verse, *ουτος ην εν αρχη*, this was or existed in eternity. Nowhere, it may be remarked, can you find a more appropriate, and when you consider the state of man, a more necessary introduction than this. It has certainly been most miserably mangled in the translations, but it stands out from scores of introductions like the Bass in the Frith of Forth or the Craig in the Frith of Clyde. *Παντα δι' αυτου εγενετο, και χωρις αυτου εγενετο ουδε εν*, all things created themselves by means of Him, and without Him not even *one thing created itself*. Here we see the continued repetition distinctly verified and fixed upon us. Why should it not be repeated? The importance of the subject, the true condition of man, as much in this as in other ages of the world, cry out for this repetition. What, indeed, it may again be asked, can be more important or more essential for man to know than that he is himself, in a great measure, his own creator? That he may make himself what he *will*, is one of the eternal consequences of this introduction. The God or Word exists within man, forming him according to his own heart's desire, is one of the repeated truths deducible from this introduction. Here there is freedom and no freedom, fatalism and no fatalism. *Το φως εν τη σκοτια φαινει, και η σκοτια αυτο ου κετελαβεν*, the light shines in the darkness, and the darkness has not confounded it. Here again is repetition. We often hear the monstrous hue and cry from false Christians, about the indistinctness and darkness of the light! Thanks however to John, that in his repeated introduction, there is no such nonsense and deadly poison. If we listen to you, it should have been the light does not shine in the darkness, *because the darkness has*

*confounded it.* It is, indeed, a favourite theme with the dregs and scum of the earth everywhere, to cry down the Light.<sup>a</sup>

### *Truisms of John.*

The truisms of John is another ramification of the same topic of repetitions. Though mankind however delight in truisms and their connection, they, in a state of evil, frequently manifest an antipathy when they are applied to themselves. Many called philosophers, glory in the application of truisms to a certain class of physical things, optics and astronomy, while they obstinately resist their application to the moral physical existence and happiness of man. According to these absurd one-eyed creatures, truisms, or mathematics, have no connection whatever with the subject, even though the principle on which the laws of common physics depend is equally applicable to the laws of mind and moral existences. The perception of the connection between cause and effect shines as distinctly in the morals of life, as in the demonstration of a law of the physics of matter. The separation of the two, is at once an impious and monstrous absurdity, of which only monstrous one-eyed things can be guilty. The light that predicts the fate and fall of an erring kingdom, predicts also the fate and fall of an erring planet. There neither are, nor what is stronger still can be, discordant or isolated laws of mind and matter, except in the brains of deformed individuals. In all ages of the world, stars have appeared in the east and west to guide and direct mankind to the haven of these truths and their consequences, peace and happiness. Remarkable to relate, if we are justified in using such an obvious expression, it was the light of truisms which they held

---

<sup>a</sup> It may be as well to observe here the propriety of the translation of *confounded* in the following: περιπατετε ως το φως έχιτε, ινα μη σκοτια υμας καταλαβη, walk while you have the light, lest darkness confound you. It is added, the walker in darkness knows not whither he goes.—JOHN, xii. 35.

up for their direction. Truisms were the things that stood uppermost in their minds: it was moral and physical truisms, with which they often commenced their discourses; it was the same truisms with which they as often concluded them.

Ουθεις, πονηρον πραγμα, χρηστος ων, ποιει,  
No one, when good, does an evil action,

is a saying of the Greek poet, Menander, on which the eternal mathematical law of truisms in reference to morals, is exclusively founded. Good will produce evil as soon as two and two make eight. The one is as much a truism as the other, and founded on the very same law or principle. Hence too the similar saying of the Messiah, Παν δενδρον αγαθον καρπους καλους ποιει, every good tree produces good fruit, but a corrupt tree produces evil fruit. Hence John, following up as a matter of course his truisms of the Messiah, says, Το γεγεννημενον εκ της σαρκος, σαρξ εστι· και το γεγεννημενον εκ του πνευματος, πνευμα εστι, the fruit of the flesh is flesh, and the fruit of the spirit is spirit! These are the sayings and the doings which all lights, from the beginning of the world till now, have echoed and re-echoed to the learned and the unlearned. Amusements are very well, and even commendable in their way, but they are altogether out of place when mankind are going down the precipice, involving themselves and their neighbours and their children in one universal moral and physical destruction. *If your son ask a fish, do you give him a serpent?* is a well known moral and physical truism, which it becomes you, versed in wisdom, to repeat to the multitudes, that listen to your verbose, nonsensical harangues. Ει ουν υμεις, πονηροι οντες, οιδατε δοματα αγαθα διδοναι τοις τεκνοις υμων, if you then, THOUGH EVIL, know to give good gifts to your children, do you consider yourselves blind to the understanding and the practice of these eternal moral truths; or that by neglecting their practice, you can escape the consequences?

### *The Greek Article.*

As this ramification however of the subject is, though interesting, like many others, extensive, one or two examples only shall be given. It is said when the Samaritans came to him, they besought him to remain with them, *και εμεινεν εκει δυο ημερας*, and he remained there two days. At the forty-third verse, it is added, *μετα δε τας δυο ημερας*, after however *the two* days. John here keeps up the connection of the thought and the fact, which is entirely lost sight of in the vulgar version.

### ΤΟ ΟΡΟΣ *the mountain.*

The Greek article, *το*, is here connected with the subject in a manner of which the vulgar versions and the Christian world appear to have no knowledge whatever. The *το ορος*, *the mountain*, to which Jesus is said to have often retired from the people by himself, or in company with his disciples, is peculiarly interesting and remarkable. It is even synonymous with the very existence and understanding of the scriptures and the gospels. It is the very life of Jesus himself. Hence it is often related of him, that he goes up, *εις το ορος*, *to the mountain* to pray. *Ανηλθε δε εις το ορος ο Ιησους και εκει εκαθητο μετα των μαθητων αυτου*, Jesus however went up to *the mountain*, and *there he sat* with his disciples. The vulgar versions, totally ignorant of this peculiar mountain, to which Jesus so often resorts, give us the definite article *a*, instead of *the*, for our guide. There must indeed be something very extraordinary about this mountain, for thither he almost always goes to teach his disciples. The celebrated sermon, in the fifth of Matthew, is given to his disciples on this very mountain. *Ιδων δε τους οχλους ανεβη εις το ορος, και καθισαντος αυτου, προς ηλθον αυτω οι μαθηται αυτου*, seeing however the multitudes, *he went up to the mountain*, and when he sat, his disciples came to him. He is however represented in other places as approaching near to the *base*



of this celebrated mountain, which occasions a great sensation among the whole multitude of the disciples. Εγγιζοντος δε αυτου, says Luke, ηδη προς τη καταβασει του ορους των Ελαιων, ηρξαντο απαν το πληθος των μαθητων χαιροντες αινειν τον Θεον. A knowledge of this mountain explains beautifully why Christ is said to go *not up*, as the earthly locality of Capernaum would imply, but *κατεβη, down* to Capernaum, an expression which John employs in his third chapter.

In a material point of view, a mountain evidently represents a higher state of things on the earth. In ancient times, mountains were the peculiar localities for the celebration of the most sacred things. Even in our own country, vestiges of this fact are yet perceptible. In the Old Testament, the phraseology of *the mountain* is common. Hence mount Sion, mount Sina, mount Horeb, all remarkable for the qualities of which we speak. Moses often went up to the mountain. The truth is, the dregs of all material things fall by their own drossy nature to the earth, or base of the mountain, while the less drossy and the etherial, on the contrary rise. Hence the selfish, the cruel, the cunning, are of the earth, and live at the base or root of this very mountain. It is remarkable, when these truths are traced to their foundation and brought home, that they refer to man; that *this very mountain* is the head of man; that the wicked and descendants of Cain are represented by the ancients as living at the *base* of this celebrated mountain, the *very base* where Cain is said to have slain his brother. It is remarkable that the *animal, selfish and destructive* qualities of man exist at the base of the head or brain!! How significant! "I have seen," says Ephrem Syrus, of the fourth century, writing in Syriac, "Paradise with the eye of my mind. Its vertex towers above the tops of other mountains; and though the waters of the deluge have covered the earth, they have rubbed only its base."

## EK or EΞ.

The Greek preposition *εκ*, occurs more frequently in John than in Luke, or the generality of the Greek writers. It might in some cases have been altogether dispensed with, and summed up in the common genitive. It appears however to be sometimes used in a sense unknown to the vulgar, and even learned translators of Christendom. Hence the misconstrued sentence, *οτι η σωτηρια ΕΚ των Ιουδαιων εστιν*, for salvation exists out of the Jews, that is, *out of the pale* of the Jews. The vulgar rendering is, for salvation is *of* the Jews, which is absurd, and totally inconsistent with the sense and context. The spiritual Messiah tells the woman of Samaria, that the true worshippers shall worship the Father, neither in this mountain, nor among the Jerusalemites. The reason is assigned, we know what we worship, for salvation exists *out of*, or *apart from*, the Jews. Some of the older Greek writers use this Greek preposition *εκ* in the same sense as John. It is used by Homer in the sense, *beyond*, of which the following is an example :

Οσσοί μοι ΕΚ πασεων Κρονιδης Ζεὺς ἀλγέ' ἔδωκεν.

ΓΙΝΩΣΚΩ, Εἶδew, Οἶδα, *know*, Ερχομαι.

There are no verbs so frequently used by John as the verbs *γινωσκω*, *εἶδew*, *οἶδα*, *know*, and *ερχομαι*, *come*. The latter, *ερχομαι*, *to come*, is by far the most frequently used. It occurs nearly two hundred times in the gospel of John alone. It occupies, too, as conspicuous a position in the other gospels. It is worthy of a separate and distinct investigation, in consequence of the peculiar ideas and importance which it represents in all the gospels. The *coming* hour, the *coming* Christ, the *coming* wrath or retribution, the *coming* of man are kindred and essential ramifications of the meaning of the verb, *ερχομαι*. Some poor, ignorant, bewildered sects of Christendom, towards whom we must exercise compassion, are at this present moment actually

looking for the *coming* of Christ in the skies. Long will these bewildered, but it may be, sincere creatures, look in this sublime quarter for the vulgar mission. Their notions resemble the old scouted notions, even the gaudy trappings of an earthly Jewish reign and vulgar monarchy, with which the true coming of the Messiah has nothing to do. This very personage has come, and you in the language of the Messiah, have done to Him, what you would. Important however as this verb is, we decline at the present entering into its peculiar element. We merely here, like a sign-post on the highway, direct the traveller in quest of truth, not to forget its bearing on the intelligence and spirit of John. Our more immediate object is the verbs, *γινωσκω*, *εἶδew*, *οἶδα*, of whose importance in the eyes of John, some idea may be formed from the following examples:—*Γινωσκω*, i. 10, 24, 48; ii. 25; iii. 10; iv. 1, 53; v. 6, 42; vi. 15, 69; vii. 17, 26, 27, 49, 51; viii. 27, 28, 31, 43, 52, 55; x. 6, 14, 15, 22, 27, 38; xi. 57; xii. 9, 16; xiii. 7, 12, 28, 35; xiv. 7, 9, 17, 20, 31; xv. 18; xvi. 3, 19; xvii. 3, 7, 8, 23, 25; xix. 4; xxi. 17. In some of these verses, there are two or three examples of the same verb, *γινωσκω*, *know*, from which you see its position in the estimation of John. *Εἶδew*, *οἶδα*, bearing on the very same idea as *γινωσκω*, is equally numerous: i. 26, 31, 38; ii. 6; iii. 2, 8, 11; iv. 10, 22, 25, 32, 42; v. 13, 32; vi. 6, 42, 61, 64; vii. 15, 27, 28, 29; viii. 14, 19, 37, 55; ix. 12, 20, 21, 24, 25, 29, 30, 31; x. 4, 5; xi. 22, 24, 42, 49; xii. 35, 50; xiii. 1, 3, 7, 17, 18; xiv. 4, 5, 15, 21; xvi. 18, 30; xviii. 2, 21; xix. 10, 28, 35; xx. 2, 8, 9, 13, 14; xxi. 4, 12, 15, 16, 17, 24. These verbs might indeed have been numbered among the repetitions. From these, however, the uninformed reader will perceive that our holy evangelist had some grand object in feeling and in contemplation. It is altogether false, that he wrote these without knowing and feeling every inch of his way.

It is wise and good to look at mankind and their modes

of action. A knowledge of the disease is half the cure. It is not necessary to have recourse to the silly phrase, *the world*, for a solution of the difficulty, for the blind purpose of shifting the blame from ourselves. This may be supposed to be a very convenient phrase for *the world become Christian*, and *yet the world* after *all*, to rid itself of the awkward position of being identified as the worthless party. The knowledge however of the fact, is fixed upon the guilty from within, in a voice which no equivocation, tergiversation, or prevarication, can silence or put down; for this guilty knowledge has become a part of their very existence. Whithersoever they go, it goes along with them; when they stop, it stops; when they sit down to rest themselves from the cares of an evil existence, it often, like a dark, dim, but real spectre, rises up against them, and demands and redemands, unwilling though they be, a just and proper hearing. Even when they slumber, it often wakes to disturb their slumbers. Rid themselves of this knowledge, the arbiter of their fate, the judge of the living and the dead, they never can, even though they compass sea and land, and plunge into their former guilty joys and tainted pleasures, or mix with their like discordant associates in the merry dance and bewitching revelry; even though they act the easy lounge, or play a part in the heartless laugh, or fictitious smile of the fashionable rich, or join the throng of the less fictitious, but little less guilty, simple, degraded poor. But wherever they move, they never fail to recognise their own associates. There is nothing doubtful about this. Darkness is not light, and light is not darkness. It is in short with them, as with the evil spirits in the Acts, Jesus we *know*, and Paul we *know*, but who are you?

It has been a favourite topic with the bad in all ages to confound the differences of things; to introduce chaos and chaotic notions on the most momentous distinctions of life. According to these people it is not only difficult, but extremely difficult to *know* the good from the bad. According

to them it requires a telescope of an immensely magnifying power, such as no astronomer ever devised, to obtain the most distant approximation to the knowledge of the subject. If you believe these pitiable sinners, it is impossible to know whether you are standing on your head or your feet. You must call in the aid too of a dozen people, equally, it may be, worthless as themselves, to give their testimony of your character, though it is written in legible letters on your forehead and your face, which babes and sucklings that cannot run, can read distinctly; and when called in, you have the mortified consolation of being doubtful after all; and hence you must be received like the bad themselves, with excessive caution. The bad have no testimony from within or from without. They *know* and feel this; and bad like, they wish to deprive the good—who cannot mix with them, or the world, without becoming like themselves, bad—of the testimony which they have and must have in spite of all the opponents of the earth. With John, and Jesus, and Paul, the good say, ΗΜΕΙΣ ΟΙΔΑΜΕΝ, WE KNOW OURSELVES that we are of God, and do not therefore require your testimony. You *know* what you are; we *know* what we are! Your only wisdom however and salvation, is, to admit the light, to follow the light, and to testify of the light. If you attempt to overthrow it, to crucify it, or put it to death, it will rise again the third day according to the scriptures, and torment you; we therefore counsel you, like Caiaphas, to let these men alone. We again commend the intelligence and spirit of the holy evangelist John, in the use and the abuse of these extraordinary Greek verbs, γινωσκω—οιδα—ειδew, *know—know—know!* But whether John was a Gnostic or not, we *leave* for others the interesting, learned, and historical investigation.

ΠΟΙΕΩ, *sayings and doings.*

The verb ποιew, *to do*, is like γινωσκω, ειδew, οιδα, ep-

χομαι, one of John's just and great favourites. If we say it occurs one hundred and fifty times in his holy gospel, we are not perhaps exaggerating. All the world will maintain the essential distinction between sayings and doings; the boundary between the two is apparently so well marked and striking, that it may justly be said, a blind man may see it. None in his senses, one might think, could ever by any possibility confound the distinction, or feel any difficulty in steering his course in life between the two abstract propositions; yet in the midst of all this clearness, such is the confounded stupidity, weakness, and badness of the multitudes, that nothing seems to be more difficult. Even if a man of the most undoubted goodness, a case which we are ashamed to conceive, strewing in his eternal path goodness, happens to use an expression towards the world, the produce of their own bad conduct, which is not hedged round and round like an impregnable rampart, they immediately, like the Jews of old, yell the old yell, Crucify him, crucify him; it is not fit that such a one should live. It matters not a straw, though a hundred and fifty times of their life, they have with one voice declared that never man spoke like this man. John saw all this, declared and wrote what he saw, and we *know* that his testimony is true! The remarkable accusation against the Messiah of old for his condemnation, is, *ὅτι αὐτὸν υἱὸν Θεοῦ ἐποίησε*, because he *made himself a son of God*. How can a man *make himself* a son of God? By *doing* like Him, by *working* like Him. Hence the well known declaration of John, *Ὁ πατήρ μου ἕως ἄρτι ἐργάζεται, καὶ ἔγω ἐργάζομαι*, my Father hitherto works, and I work. It is not sayings, but doings, that constitute the element of God and good men. Go thou, and *do* likewise, is the declaration of the same evangelist.

### *Many Mansions in the House of God.*

The Messiah says, that in his father's house are many mansions. The head of man is the house of God. How

important is this consideration ! After the dissolution of the body, what other mansions may there be ?

*Ὀνομα, or name.*

*Ὀνομα*, or *name*, occurs frequently in John. It is applied to the name יְהוָה, God, among the Hebrews ; it has been already explained. It only remains to be added, that in the course of ages, a superstitious veneration, and even the working of miracles, was attached to the letters by the Jews. Hence its peculiar application in John.

*Εἰς, one.*

A small phrase, properly applied, sometimes casts more light on an author's knowledge of a language than more important topics. The expression of John, speaking of the two angels, he says, *εἷς ἄνθρωπος πρὸς τὴν κεφαλὴν, καὶ εἷς ἄνθρωπος πρὸς τοὺς πόδας*, which is a good Greek mode of expression.

*Ἐντεuthεν καὶ Ἐντεuthεν.*

This at first resembles the *hinc atque hinc* of the Latins ; but into this we do not enter. The Syriac *ܐܝܢܐ ܕܡܝܢ ܕܡܝܢ*, that is, *one there and one there*.

*Καὶ, Δε, Γαρ, Οὐν, Μεν, Ἰνα.*

From the position and arrangement of these Greek particles in the gospel, one may form some opinion of the author's knowledge of the language. In no case, however, does John display any ignorance of this subject ; and though in the beginning of his gospel, he has had frequent recourse to *καὶ*, it is neither improper, nor does it arise from ignorance of another, and what some might suppose, a better construction. *Καὶ, and*, in many places and kinds of composition holds a more important and honourable position than the crowd of writers often contemplate. In several passages, he has even used *καὶ* in the delicate, elegant construction of the qualifying sense of *even*, which the thoughtless might not expect from John. It is a question whether

the *και*, which precedes ο *λογος* of the fourteenth verse may not be considered in this sense, thus, *even* the Word. But whatever may be said on this subject, he never fails to place his *δε* in its proper Greek position in the sentence. Take for example : *μετα Δε ταυτα, εγραψε Δε και τιτλον, οι Δε Ιουδαιοι, Θωμας Δε. His γαρ* is equally well posted, as, *εγω Γαρ ουχ, οι Γαρ μαθηται. Hence also his ουν, as, τουτοι Ουν τον τιτλον, οι Ουν Ιουδαιοι, ηλθον Ουν οι στρατιωται. So also the μεν, του Μεν πρωτου. The ινα* is a word on which, like all other particles, much might be said for the illustration of the subject and the meaning of the author. It is however more frequently coupled with the subjunctive of the present and past tenses, than is common to Luke, or many of the Greek writers.

#### Οτι.

Οτι is a word which appears more frequently than the ideas seem to require. One feels or rather appears to feel its redundancy in one case, and its clumsiness in another. The Greeks however themselves of a more literary cast than John, have recourse to the use of expressions and expletives, which our want of refinement and delicacy of thought does not fully comprehend. We ought therefore to be cautious, for the purpose of being just in our censures. Οτι, however, might have a more pointed provincial or local bearing than one can now perfectly understand. The subject requires a frequent repetition of οτι.

#### *The Resurrection of the Dead—the Messiah.*

Of all subjects in the gospels, none occupies a more peculiar and striking position than the resurrection. It is every where referred to as an essential element of Christianity. Even without a knowledge of this subject, the scriptures are declared incapable of being understood. It appears, without any ambiguity, to be the key to a knowledge of the whole. Destroy the resurrection then, and you



instantly destroy the scriptures. Truth, however, whether figurative or real, moral or physical, corporeal or spiritual, will remain unchanged and unchangeable, whatever route mankind take in their peregrinations through life ; whether indeed they erect castles in the air or on the earth ; whether they go on to destroy or to preserve each other ; whether, in short, they continue to repeat the old satanic dogma, Every one for himself and God for us all, or cry out in the simple expressive spirit of the heavens, He that loves not his brother whom he has seen, how can he love God whom he has not seen ? Man, the wolf, may change, and become in the course of years or centuries, a lamb ; but the character of the elements, peculiar to the transmigration from the one state of things to the other, has been the same in all ages. The Christian resurrection, however, about which so much controversy has been raised, is, whatever notion you entertain of it, merely the last or rather the only stage on the high road of civilization. Before therefore you become a Christian in the strict sense of the term, you must pass through this celebrated stage of refinement. In the midst, however, of your eager desires and curiosities to know something of this resurrection before you do pass, you may perhaps offer the current coin, and barter commodities of your earthly selfish kingdom, gold and silver, things very precious in your eyes, but this you may be told with becoming humility, cannot be purchased with money. Words, indeed, may be presented, but words without ideas are ciphers. Similes and comparisons, tropes and figures, and parables the most expressive and beautiful, may be employed for illustration, still the subject though a dead letter to you, may be a living one to others. In the common expressive proverbial language of scripture, it may even be said of some of you, with eyes you may not see, with ears you may not hear, even though one thunder in your ears. In all the gospels, the scriptures appear difficult to the disciples themselves. They are represented as com-

mitting great blunders, drawing the most unfounded conclusions, even exhausting the patience of the faithful expounder. In this, however, shine forth the wisdom, intelligence, and goodness of the authors. The purity, dignity, and sublimity of the resurrection cannot be understood by men living at the base of the mountain: mankind are so exceedingly gross, conceited, envious, sensual, selfish, devilish. Hence the frequent allusion to the subject in general writings among ourselves, the lover, rendering the present scene disagreeable.

O take me from a world I hate,  
Men, cruel, selfish, sensual, cold,  
And in some pure, ethereal state,  
Let me my kindred minds behold.

They are almost incapable of understanding great, beautiful, noble, disinterested truths, which are scattered everywhere around them, and of which too they themselves are the centres. They revert almost always to their low, dirty element, the sty. Their ideas, figures, and comparisons are all borrowed from the same filthy source, the phraseology of the sty. But even in common, sensual, material things, they are not merely low and grovelling, but very limited and circumscribed. Hence even in this far famed civilized age, in which little men see too much improvement, the educated themselves have little knowledge of the beautiful leaf, the fine tree, the noble building, or sensible, moral picture. Deformities in these earthly becoming pursuits may, for aught they know to the contrary, be real beauties. Carry them with you to man and his infinite variations of form and deformity, and how few will remark any form or deformity but the trunk and face. The height, breadth, beauty, or quality of the head, the source of all forms and deformities, is not their element. Carry them beyond these to the spirit which inhabits this fabric; talk to them of a noble thought, a beautiful comparison, or of ~~the~~ ease with which a great mind collects from all quarters

materials for expression, and what will be the result? *Εἰ τα ἐπιγεια εἶπον ὑμῖν, καὶ οὐ πιστεύετε, πῶς εἰπὼ ὑμῖν τα ἐπουρανία, πιστεύσετε*, if I have told you earthly things, and you believe not, when will you believe if I tell you heavenly things?

In the Epistles, the same subject of the resurrection is always uppermost. It matters not whether the books be canonical or uncanonical, the doctrine of the resurrection courts your attention. In the uncanonical second Epistle of Timothy, there is a passage particularly worthy of your notice. *Ὡν ἐστὶν Ὑμεναῖος καὶ Φιλητος, οἵτινες περὶ τὴν ἀληθειαν ἡστοχησαν, λέγοντες τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἤδη γεγενῆσθαι*, of whom is Hymenæus and Philetus, who concerning the truth have erred, saying that the resurrection has already taken place, or perhaps is already going on. This Epistle was evidently written, at least passages were introduced, for the purpose of destroying the true resurrection. Paul says in Romans, *Εἰ γὰρ συμφύτοι γεγόναμεν τῷ ὁμοιωματὶ τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς ἀνάστασεως ἐσομεθα*, for if we have made ourselves of a similar nature to the likeness of his death, nevertheless we shall also belong to the resurrection; from which, and many other passages of scripture, it may be deduced that there is another and a better resurrection even here than that of the body.

The best Syrian writers, of whom Bar Hebræus is one, speak confidently of the kingdom of heaven as composed of a cloud of celestial virtues. The best informed Greek writers and fathers, are all favourable to this resurrection. The learned Erasmus, on a review of this subject, speaks of them in the note below.<sup>a</sup> But our object here is not to

---

<sup>a</sup> His own words, from his edition of 1516, are the following :—*Ex resurrectione mortuorum Jesu Christi. Locus hic trifariâ legi potest. Nos rationes omnem simpliciter, id quod est instituti, proponemus, penes lectorum erit, et judicandi ius, et elegendi potestas. Primam lectionem UTRES FEMINE EXCURTI videntur, ut SENSUS SIT, uirtutum divinam et spiritum sanctificationis fuisse declaratum, ex hoc quod multa corpora sanctorum resurrexerunt*

enlarge much on the subject of the ancients. We give their views, however, as incontrovertible.

The disciples never understood the scriptures before the resurrection. When therefore, says John, *εγερθη εκ νεκρων*, he was risen from the dead, his disciples remembered and understood the meaning. If you look at the Christian man, Mahometan, or Hebrew, without any microscopic observations, or wish to depreciate his excellencies, with every thing fitted to make him happy, in the midst of the best arrangements of day and night, of summer and winter, of seed time and harvest; in the midst of his own constitution and powers, not one of which he can call his own, denying in *practise* the very God in whom he lives, moves, and has his being; and spreading in return everywhere the most frightful selfishness, in connection with a parcel of the most trifling rites and ceremonies, what name in the language is fitted for the monster? *Dead*, in this state of things, is a mild phrase for his designation. *Dead* in trespasses and in sins, is the phraseology of the scriptures. This is the first death, which is followed by the resurrection of the scriptures, called the first resurrection, over which a second death is said to have no power.

The heretical false Christians should be told, that the resurrection of the vulgar Messiah was not the first. Many individuals are given as having risen or been raised from the dead, both in the Old and the New Testament. Their Christ, therefore, cannot be called the first fruits of those

---

cum Christo, quemadmodum recensuit Matthæus Evangelista. Cui sententiæ non admodum refrager, *præsertim cum videam* non displicuisse ORIGENI, HIERONYMO vero etiam PLACUISSE. Maxime cū Paulus Christu appellet primogenitum ex mortuis et primogenitū ex multis fratribus, et primitias dormientium. Super omnia, quod capitis et membrorum eadem sit resurrectio, ut quemadmodum *Origenes scribit*, Christi gloriam nondum esse perfectam, nisi collectis totius corporis membris, ita resurrectio illius non sit perfecta, nisi reliqua etiam membra suo capiti socientur. In Christo igitur coepta est resurrectio, et spes præbita mebris. *Unde sic accipi potest, ut mortuorum Jesu Christi et ipsius eadem sit resurrectio.*

that slept. Many of the saints, it is said by Matthew, rose with the Messiah, and appeared in the holy city. The last observation is, that there is no appearance of theft about the sepulchre.

*The Place of the Crucifixion of the Messiah.*

The τοπος, or *place* for the crucifixion of the Messiah, as given by John and the Evangelists, is very peculiar. Εξήλθεν εις τον λεγομενον ΚΡΑΝΙΟΥ τοπον, which Luke expresses, επι τον τοπον τον καλουμενον ΚΡΑΝΙΟΝ. The former is *the place* of the Head, the latter is the accusative, *the place called the Head*. John, who is always anxious to explain his terms, says, it is called in the Hebrew, Γολγοθα. The Greek letters, however, do not convey the best representation of the Hebrew, which is גִּלְגֹּתָי, Golgoth, probably the *l* is thrown out for euphony, the *cranium*, or *head*; the root is, *something round*. Γολγοθα, or γογολτα, refers more to the Chaldaic or Syriac than the Hebrew. John says immediately after, the head, *where* they crucified him: Luke, *there* they crucified him, and the evildoers: Matthew, Εις τοπον λεγουμενον Γολγοθα, ος εστι λεγομενος κρανιου τοπος: Mark, Επι Γολγοθα, ο εστι μεθερμηνευομενον κρανιου τοπος. Hence the place of a *Head* is the more general. Evidently, it is not a place of *Heads*, which one would expect for a common burying ground. The Syriac is ܕܠܓܬܐ, which is equally extraordinary.

Moreover, in the place, εν τω τοπω, where he was crucified, there was a κηπος, *garden*; και εν τω κηπω, and in the garden; μνημειον καινον, a new or public sepulchre; εν ω in which, ουδεπω ουδεις ετεθη, none was ever laid.

The wise and good may perceive that the Head of man is the Golgotha, or the *new Tomb, the Garden*, where mankind crucify the Anointed of God. Those, however, in whom the greatest part of the Divinity exists, have always been the first to suffer. The Jews, among whom the

scene of the crucifixion is laid, have been as notorious as any people for the crucifixion of the Light. It is high time for them to give up their foolish rites and ceremonies, and worship God in spirit and by truth. Let them erect, like Jacob, whom they pretend to follow, an altar in *בית אל*, *Beth Al*, that is, *house of God*, or in their own *heads*. Their going to the east or west, of which false Christians foolishly talk, is foreign to the subject.

### *The Greek Text.*

This is not the proper place for entering into the purity of the present text of the Gospel of John. The subject is too extensive for the present introductory dissertation. There are a thousand other things which claim attention, but we must very reluctantly decline their consideration. Among others, is the originality of John. The book of Job is a drama. Several other parts of the Old Testament are dramatic.

### *The Women at the Cross and the Sepulchre.*

When the Messiah had nearly finished his conversation with the woman of Samaria, it is observed by John that his disciples arrived, and *εθυνμασαν οτι μετα γυναικος ελαλει*, wondered that he talked with a woman: from which it might be inferred, that women were generally held in low estimation among the Jews. This is true. The same feeling extended a considerable way over the East. In the Gospels, however, things are different. They are represented as holding a higher position, and deservedly so, in the scale of creation. The women are quick at perception, feel acutely, and often act according to their feelings; but their perceptions are good, and their feelings often the best of all reasons; and though they commit great blunders, and frequently act against the light, yet in their aberrations, though sometimes wild and terrific, you may trace the footsteps of extreme justice. In what is called the

lower ranks of life, they are above their husbands in manners and morals; and under a judicious management might, with their judgment, be made great instruments for carrying out a better state of things. From first to last in the gospels, they are faithful and devoted followers of the Messiah. Luke saw a great company of people and *women* weeping as he bore his cross; John speaks of three women and one man standing round his cross. None is more faithful than a woman. Mary Magdalen was the first at the sepulchre, and the first that the Messiah addressed after his resurrection.

### *Qualities of John's Style.*

The Greek of John is in some places rather inferior to that of Luke, even though his ideas may, in several points of view, be considered superior, and, if we can use the expression, more appropriate to the Messiah. Generally speaking, however, there is a greater simplicity, and even fluency about John's style than the other Evangelists. Each, however, has his beauties. He is very perspicuous and intelligent in his narrations and descriptions. In this quality, certainly, none of the Evangelists are his equals. When he does throw himself fully, which he does not always do, into his narrations, he never fails strongly to interest his readers. It would indeed be difficult to find a more interesting, intelligent, or pointed conversation than his ninth chapter; or one more serious, affecting, dignified, or inspired, than his seventeenth, in connection with the night on which the Messiah was betrayed. The subjects, however, of the two are widely different; a circumstance which ought not to be overlooked in the discrimination of the author. There is even infinite more point and intelligence, and what might be called, coming home strongly but delicately, about the former, than the vulgar Christians understand. The view, however, here given of his Greek and Gospel, places him in an infinitely more favourable light

than he has ever stood, at least in modern Christendom. There are, however, considerable variations in his style; for it is by no means equal. The introduction to his gospel, though highly appropriate, requisite, and perfectly in accordance with the spirit of the work, does not very strongly resemble some other parts of his composition; yet there is in it the very something, which might be expected from the author. There is obviously much more dignity of sentiment and feeling about him, than he generally exhibits in his writings. He even seems afraid of being identified or displaying himself; a fact which strongly characterises his gospel, and the purity, wisdom, and goodness of his mind. He will however be infinitely better seen and read in his characters, descriptions, and sayings of the Pharisees and the notorious world, as mankind are designated, than in his language. The short question of the Pharisees, after the Messiah had finished his observations, reflecting on the blindness of those who say they see, *are we blind also?* displays the penetration and wisdom of a master-mind. No less striking and excellent is the silly question of the multitude, *have any of the rulers believed on him?* Nothing, indeed, can excel these cutting strokes of wisdom; they speak volumes; they will live while man exists, and be held up as eternal beacons of Pharisees' malignity on the one hand, and the badness, weakness, ignorance of multitudes on the other. He selects the best opportunities for the introduction of his characters, and places them in the most prominent, affecting, delicate positions. The object, essence, and spirit of his work are however nearly as far removed as possible from the modern system of bookmaking, yet his words, common and proper; his phrases, Grecian, Hebraic, Syriac, or Samaritan; his allusions, physical, local, temporal, geographical, are all intentionally and very expressive, from which the book-makers themselves may learn sense. His Cana, Galilee, Capernaum, Nicodemus, Cedron, Siloam, Lazarus, Mag-



dalene, Bethany, Pilate, are examples of this kind of eloquence. Even the very dress and external circumstances of his characters, the time of the day or night on which things are done, have all a peculiar language, which the student only, deeply read in ancient customs and literature, deeply read in the mysteries of himself and the things of God, can fully comprehend. Hence the garment of the Messiah, woven without seam, denoting the unity of the Divinity and the unity of man. Hence the expressive *dark* night on which he was betrayed, the visit of the faithful Mary Magdalene to the sepulchre *early in the morning*, *σκοτίας ἐν ὀψιῃ*, when yet *dark*. The very quarters, indeed, whither the Messiah travels, journeying as he is often described with his *face* towards Jerusalem, or going down to Capernaum, up the mountain, or descending among the crowd, or retiring apart, are all specimens of eloquence as concise as extraordinary.

*Portrait of the Messiah—Wisdom and Spirit of John.*

Of all heroes, none equals John's hero. Talk indeed of the courageous, merciless, brutal Achilles; of the more pious, comparatively noble, Æneas; of far-famed, selfish, destructive warriors of antiquity or modern times, whose very names are a disgrace to humanity, whose very course of action is based on evil and propagated in evil; or of the noble, sacred, wise, learned men of antiquity, whose light, like stars in the firmament, even at this remote distance, still strongly enlightens our northern hemisphere; yet who of this honourable number should be named in the comparison. The thought, indeed, is a sort of profanity, of which we will not be guilty. Even these wise learned men themselves, all drank more or less of the water of life, of which John so often speaks. They all saw and tasted the river of death and the river of life, and they in compassion instructed mankind to drink the latter and shun the

former. They themselves, philosophers and poets, spoke like John of the *τον Θεον*, God as above all and in all things, as existing and speaking within man ; like John, of the *ναον του σωματος*, temple of the body ; like John, of a quality resembling *πιστις*, *truth*, confidence, or faith ; as the crown-ing arch of the whole moral, spiritual, godlike substratum of existence in man. They hoped, many of them, confidently of another and a better state of things, and we doubt not their hopes are realized, for their works must follow them. Some, indeed, gave up their lives for the truth and the instruction of the multitudes, and calmly and seriously philosophized in solitude, or with a few friends, on the prospect of the dissolution of the body and the immortality of the soul. These are really great men compared with the grovelling multitudes. But the Messiah, whose course John and the Evangelists have pourtrayed, is, compared with them, something like the sun in our system. They are stars, or secondary planets, for they still shine, deriving their light and heat from the primary. Wherever the Messiah moves, darkness disappears or melts away, like the mist of the morning before the summer sun. He is emphatically, as described by John, the light of the world. It is therefore perfectly consistent that when crucified on the cross, one of the Evangelists should speak of darkness seizing the whole earth. But view him more closely in his works and conversations ! His disciples, and the individuals around him, are men ; he appears more like a God, with all the wants and feelings and sympathies of a mortal. Behold him going from city to city, literally working good, not merely in the more quiet manner of a common or extraordinary man, but actively facing the most formidable dangers, meeting those deep rooted, superstitious, political evils, at which philosophers often wink, and hardened little statesmen more frequently laugh. Hence see him selecting a sabbath for the opening of the eyes of a blind man ; a

great crime in the estimation of the overrighteous Pharisees. Hence too his pointed daring opposition to their empty genealogical boastings of father Abraham: or view him in company with his disciples in public or private! Behold his conduct! What goodness, mildness, dignity, and what is equally necessary to a great character, when requisite, sternness! Extremes, indeed, a thing almost unheard of in human conduct, meet in him. How he bears with their dulness, misapprehension, and rebukes their wickedness! How he chides, and in the same breath finds an excuse for their frailties, encouraging them with the words, *The spirit is willing, but the flesh is weak!* How he expostulates with the twelve after their aberrations, when many, wrapped up in their ignorance and conceit had abandoned him, in the simple dignity of the words, *Do you also wish to go away?* Read his discourses, and hear his parables; what piety, discrimination, and penetration! What accurate dissectings of human conduct and concealed motives! Or contrast his conduct with that of the world. The common family and friendly weaknesses of the multitudes are unknown to him! How often, for example, do we see individuals, reputed for their knowledge and respectability, holding up their friends, or parents their children, though deformed in body and vicious in disposition, for the tribute of respect and admiration of the visitor! But hear Jesus! He that does the will of my father who is in the Heavens, the same is my *brother* and *sister* and *mother!* How admirable! How often do we see mankind, and the comparatively good and the foolhardy who set at nought all distinctions of companionship, thinking themselves fit for any thing and every thing! Not so Jesus, a perfect master in the discrimination of the good and the bad, a perfect antithesis to evil, yet he, though anxious to do good to all and declining the society of none, though strongly predisposed to friendship and love, yet even he wisely selects the best for his associates and bosom friends! But what of envy so common

on being driven from Paradise withdrew," continues the Syrian, "and was ordered to take up his abode in the lowest places under Paradise; and when there, they, on continuing to live unholy, were scattered; and because they did not deserve to occupy the neighbourhood of Paradise, God ordered them to be carried by the ark *օִּיִּדֵן* to the *Cardoan* mountains—that Cain withdrew to the land of *Nod*, or *vagabonds*, below those places, which Seth and Enos inhabited—that the good, who are termed sons of God, descended from these *high places*, and married the daughters of Cain, the daughters of him, I say, who lived in the plain or valley."

*Georgius Elmacinus Homaidus.*

Elmacinus Homaidus, writing in Arabic, says, "that Adam said to Cain and Abel, Take the fruits of the earth, the firstlings of the flock, and *ascend the sacred mountain*, and having entered the holy place, adore there the Lord your God. After the death of Adam, Seth took his sons and his sons' sons, and their wives, and went up with them to the *holy mountain*, where the body of Adam was, but Cain and his sons remained at the *roots of the mountain*, in the place where he slew his brother—*Abel*."

Such, indeed, are the remarkable readings and true interpretations of the holy scriptures among the Syrian writers, of which the multitudes of the West know nothing. Paradise, consequently, exists on the earth, and within man—that Paradise is a *high, holy Tor*, or *mountain*, on or in which only the good or innocent live—that nothing selfish or proud or cruel can come to this mountain—that the more wicked mankind are, the farther are they removed from Paradise—that the deluge, symbolical of wickedness or cruelty and selfishness, covers the whole earth—that marriages with the selfish and cruel, or, in other words, the children of Cain, are condemned. It appears also that a *raven*, sent out by Noah from the ark during the symbolical deluge, *could live*; but a *dove* found no rest for the sole of her foot. Ravens, which belong to the *carnivorous* class of birds, are characteristic of the wicked, or the children of Cain, and live at, or below the base of the *holy mountain* of Paradise, or in the valley, over whose children, the waters of the deluge now roll their destructive billows! It appears, moreover, that the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah *existed in the valley*—that Lot was commanded to leave *the plain* and escape for his life to *the mountain*. If you, moreover, trace the course of Moses, Joshua, and the children of Israel through the Red Sea, the wilderness, and Jordan—all of which are true figurative truths—you may always behold the same *holy mountain*. Hence the song of the children of Israel after their passage through the Red Sea speaks of this mountain. Behold Moses going to the top of Pisgah to see Paradise and the promised land, in which Joshua the son of Nun lived. In the Psalms and other parts of Scripture, the top of the same holy mountain appears above the tops of all other mountains.

*Critical and Geographical Observations on the Evangelists in reference to the ܬܘܪ, Tor, or Mountain.*

The most perfect ignorance prevails in Christendom on the subject of the holy *Tor*, to which Jesus resorts. We have works innumerable coming out every year, but no knowledge of this mountain appears. We have works from the *Society for Useful Knowledge*, representing a *Tabor* of Lower Galilee as the scene of the Messiah's transfiguration. We have works from the *Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge*, without a single idea on the subject. Even Chambers, who talks so much of information for the people, says, "there is not perhaps to be found in the whole compass of the globe, one spot, from which a believer in the Gospel can possibly enjoy a more sublime prospect than from the summit of *Mount Tabor*." What a different world it would be, if the ignorant would not attempt to instruct mankind!

*Tor* is the Syriac word for *mountain*; Hebrew, צור, רר; Greek is the same origin, OP—ος : os, the termination has nothing to do with the root; but the T is discarded in the transmission of the word, otherwise it would be *Toe*. In whatever part of Palestine the Messiah is represented, we always find in the Syriac the same *Tor*, *mountain*. In the fifth of Matthew, AN—ܐܒܗ ܐܝܬ ܐܘܪܝܬ, it is, Syriac, ܬܘܪ, to the *Tor*. If he appears in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, a hundred miles from Galilee, the *Tor*, or *mountain*, is the same word. In all the Evangelists, Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, the Syriac presents the same word, *Tor*. I hope, therefore, that we shall hear no more of this ignorance, and that all these societies, but particularly the *Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge*, will take the earliest opportunity to teach this true knowledge of Christianity to the people. In short, Matthew, Luke, John, and Paul himself, speaking in Galatians of the same allegorized holy, *true mountain*, use the same Syriac word *Tor*. Hence also the *Taurus Mountain*.

It may farther be remarked, that though the Evangelists in general carefully notice the *ascent* and the *descent*, or in Greek phrase the ANA and the KATA of the Messiah, as in Matthew, AN—ܐܒܗ ܐܝܬ ܐܘܪܝܬ, he went up to the *mountain*, KATA—ܕܒܪܝܬ ܐܘܪܝܬ ܐܘܪܝܬ, when he came down from the *mountain*; yet in every case this mode of expression is not preserved; in other words, the *ascent* may be noticed, but not the *descent*. But on all very remarkable occasions the phraseology is indispensable.

Again, be it observed, that though Luke on one or two occasions makes use of the preposition EN evidently to express the idea of *ascent* to this *Tor*, as in the expression EN—ܐܘܪܝܬ ܐܘܪܝܬ, he went out to the *mountain*, yet he employs KATA, DOWN, in composition, when he describes the *descent* of the Messiah, as KATA—ܕܒܪܝܬ ܐܘܪܝܬ. Elsewhere, however, he uses ANA,

UP, in composition with *βαινω*, and KATA, the DESCENT, with *ιρχομαι*; expressions which are common to John. We now come to a conclusion, consoling ourselves with the reflection, that enough has been said to give the multitudes of Christendom some idea of the essential part of the Holy Scriptures.

## THE END.

### ERRATA.

	Page.	Line.	
For <i>ινδιζυ</i> ,	xxx,	22,	read <i>ινδιζυ</i> .
— <i>vulgos</i> ,	xxxiii,	11,	<i>vulgos</i> .
— <i>Επιτ</i> ,	16,	36,	— <i>Επιτ</i> .
— <i>dies</i>	17,	7,	— <i>does</i> .
— <i>ροσλ</i> ,	—,	21,	— <i>ροσλ</i> .
— <i>ωδωλο</i> ,	—,	—,	— <i>ωδωλο</i> .
— <i>α Δακιδαιμονισι</i> ,	—,	—,	— <i>Ω Λακιδαιμονισι</i> .
— <i>Πρωσηγγιλλατο</i> ,	35,	16,	— <i>Πρωσηγγιλλατο</i> .
— <i>and</i> ,	56,	6,	— <i>or</i> .
— <i>ιω</i> ,	63,	16,	— <i>ιω</i> .
— <i>ηττας</i> ,	72,	34,	— <i>ηττας</i> .